

THE PURISTIC MOVEMENT IN
SINHALESE (1922-1970)

Ambala Kodituwakku Gunasena

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of London
1976



ProQuest Number: 10672651

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10672651

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ABSTRACT

The present study is an attempt to examine critically the Sinhalese puristic movement extending from the 1920's to 1970, which was inaugurated by Munidasa Kumaratunga and had as its objective the resuscitation in its wholeness of the framework of classical Sinhalese grammar and style. A brief discussion of the nature of Sinhalese diglossia with occasional relevant reference to other diglossic situations is included in chapter I both to illustrate the general character of Sinhalese and to show how it could be conducive to the rise and continuance of puristic endeavour. The same chapter also presents a thumbnail sketch of the history of Sinhalese in order to establish the historical origins of the dichotomy existing between written and spoken Sinhalese. The second chapter discusses the historical and linguistic background from the end of the fifteenth century which brings to an end the classical period of Sinhalese writing, and which the modern purists regarded as incepting a period of linguistic decadence. The first beginnings of puristic revivalism can be seen in the latter half of the eighteenth century and much of the nineteenth century with their nativistic tendency. These are dealt with in chapter

III. Chapter IV is devoted to discussing the emergence of Kumaratunga, his linguistic objectives and the inception of his Heḷa Havula (Pure Sinhalese Fraternity). The fraternity's conception of language and its proper development together with its definition of grammar and correctness are taken into consideration in chapter V. Chapter VI is an analysis of the grammatical works of the movement which were designed to teach the Heḷese doctrine of perfection. The activities of the followers of Kumaratunga and their zealous endeavour to propagate his linguistic credo are dealt with in chapter VII. The final chapter discusses, firstly, the recent attempt of the Heḷa Havula to obtain authoritative recognition of its special linguistic features by using governmental backing to get them introduced into the state-sponsored Standard Sinhalese Grammar and the series of Sinhalese school text books. Secondly, it discusses the causes which led to the decline and dying out/^{of}the Heḷa movement. Two appendices are included to illustrate some of the points discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank Mr. C. H. B. Reynolds under whose supervision this work was undertaken, for the meticulous care with which he examined it and for the very valuable criticism which did much to improve its quality. He was always unsparing of his time and ever ready with helpful advice. I owe it to his generous exertions on my behalf that I was able to obtain a place at the School of Oriental and African Studies to begin my research and to continue it through many and unforeseen difficulties. To Mr. Reynolds therefore I remain deeply indebted.

Thanks are also due to Dr. M. W. Sugathapala De Silva who first introduced me to the study of linguistics and was largely instrumental in obtaining an opportunity for me to prosecute my research studies in England. I am deeply grateful for his unfailing kindness, when kindness was needed, and for the advice and great encouragement he was able to give me to proceed in my work.

I should also like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to Professors E. R. Sarachchandra and K. W. Goonewardena for their advice and encouragement.

To my friends in Sri Lanka, Dr. G. D. Wijayawardhana and Mr. G. M. D. Fernando I owe a deep debt

of gratitude for the alacrity with which they supplied me regularly with the books and periodicals I could not obtain here.

Dr. P. V. Premaratne was able to give me much valuable help in discussion. I should like to thank him most sincerely.

Finally, to my wife Sujata who, while engaging in similar academic research, obtained for me release from the pressures of every problematic circumstance and the leisure and peace of mind without which study would be impossible, as well as for the great strength and inspiration she always gave me I offer my most heartfelt thanks. Words cannot express the sum of all I owe to her, and my deepest gratitude must always remain unsaid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract		2-3
Acknowledgements		4-5
Chapter I	Introduction: Diglossia - The Situation in Sinhalese	8-52
Chapter II	The Historical and Linguistic Background (1500-1770)	53-75
Chapter III	The First Beginnings of Purism	76-102
Chapter IV	Kumaratunga, the Inception of his Heḷa Havula and its Activities	103-139
Chapter V	Linguistic Philosophy of the Heḷa Havula	140-177
Chapter VI	Grammatical Works of the Heḷa Havula	178-251
Chapter VII	The Heḷa Movement after Kumaratunga	252-282
Chapter VIII	Recent Phases of the Heḷa Movement	283-356

Conclusion	357-362
Appendix I	Some Examples of the Alterations made in the Editions of Sinhalese Classics by the Heḷa Havula
Appendix II	The Editions of the <u>Sidat Saṅga-</u> <u>rāva</u> and the Sinhalese Grammars written up to 1935
Bibliography	383-405

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

DIGLOSSIA: THE SITUATION IN SINHALESE

All languages with a fairly long history of (written) literature display some differences between the literary and spoken varieties with regard to phonology, morphology and, sometimes, syntax. In a literate society, especially in one that is educated to a knowledge and an appreciation of the writings of the past, the written and the spoken language may develop at different rates and may come to diverge from one another considerably in vocabulary and grammar. The longer the period during which a language has been committed to writing (and used for literary activities) the greater may be the discrepancy between the two registers.

Languages of these characteristics are particularly vulnerable to puristic endeavours. The reasons for this are obvious. Firstly, written records have a comparatively greater degree of permanence and subsequent writers tend to look upon them as models of

excellence, particularly in the idiom and style. Being tangible records which are available for such reference, written works have a tendency to impose restrictions on the normal linguistic evolution that takes place in any speech community. In languages which possess a lengthy literary tradition, therefore, it is possible to discern some cleavage between the language of literature and the spoken language of the people in question. The types of cleavages that can arise with the advent of the literary activity have been classified by M.W. Sugathapala De Silva in 1967 and more fully in 1975.¹

In order to establish the place that Sinhalese occupies among languages which are characterized by such cleavages, it is pertinent to give here a brief summary of De Silva's thesis. From the point of view of the relationship that obtains between spoken and written languages, he makes a five-fold classification to which he has given the following names: (i) congruent type, (ii) restricted standard type, (iii) inter-regional standard type, (iv) graphic standard type and (v) divergent

1. M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Effects of Purism on the Evolution of the Written Language: Case History of the Situation in Sinhalese', Linguistics 36 (1967), pp. 5-17; 'Problems of Literacy in Diglossic Communities', Literacy Discussion: UNESCO Special Number in Mother-tongue Literacy (forthcoming).

type. Being the product of writing for the first time what he calls congruent relationship naturally implies the absence of a literary tradition and therefore this particular type need not detain us here. In the course of time the written language either in its grammar and style or in its manner of graphical representation of sound or in both may correspond to the linguistic habits obtaining in a particular part of the wider linguistic community, in which case the relationship may be called a restricted standard type; or it may correspond to a neutral standard speech equally shared by all educated speakers in which case the relationship might reflect an inter-regional standard.¹ In the case of Chinese where the written language is capable of representing, because of its non-phonetic character of representation, all forms of speech regardless of their phonetic

1. Arabic is a good example. The grammar of written Arabic is different from the grammar of every single regional variety of Arabic, but the grammar of the written language is used for inter-communication by people belonging to different regions, and it is also used in radio newscasting etc. communicated to a number of areas at one time (For details see, C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', Word, vol. 15 (1959), pp. 325-340; reprinted in Language in Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli, 1972, pp. 232-251; see also Peter Trudgill, Sociolinguistics, 1974, pp. 118-120).

differences, the relationship would be of a graphic standard type.¹ The fact that high literary grammar etc. of, for instance, English represents the educated southern variety of English (British) speech for the most part would place the relationship that exists between spoken and written English in the restricted standard type. Written Hindi, by and large, represents the grammar of Khariboli. Classical Arabic which is used by all educated Arabs regardless of their regional variations would place Arabic in the inter-regional standard type. As mentioned above, Chinese is a classic example of the graphic standard type relationship. Sinhalese which is the subject of this thesis shows the functional divergence between the literary and non-literary usages maximally and exhibits a divergent type of relationship. It is evident that very few languages have the same functional divergence as Sinhalese; perhaps

1. Written and spoken Chinese are more independent of one another. What are conventionally referred to as different 'dialects' of Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, etc.) are written in essentially the same way. The common ideographs are interpreted and articulated according to each variety. Educated speakers of Mandarin and Cantonese are thus able to communicate with one another in writing, although they may not be able to do so in speech.

Tamil and Telugu are the nearest geographical languages of this type.

Languages where distinct sets of codified rules obtain for literary usage which distinguish it from colloquial usage are called diglossic languages. The term diglossia (modeled on the French diglossie) was first invented by Charles A. Ferguson in 1959.¹ The classic definition of diglossia that Ferguson gives is as follows: 'Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation'.² Ferguson's study was

1. C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', Word, vol. 15 (1959), pp. 325-340; reprinted in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli, 1972, pp. 232-251.

2. C. A. Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 244-245.

devoted to the analysis of four diglossic communities, namely, Arabic, Greek, Haitian (Creole) and Swiss German.¹ It is clear from Ferguson's paper that diglossia signifies a functional cleavage and in that sense it is a social phenomenon, rather than purely a linguistic one.² As he has observed, in many speech communities two or more varieties of the same language are used by some speakers under different conditions. The most frequently cited example is the standard language versus regional dialect. But what here he presents is one particular kind of standardisation where two varieties of a language exist side by side and are

1. For details, see C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli, 1972, pp. 233-249.

2. In 1962, Ferguson ventures to emphasize the sociolinguistic nature of the concept. To put it simply, one type of language is allowed in some social situations and another type of language is used in other social situations which prohibits the use of the former. For details, see C. A. Ferguson, 'Problems of teaching languages with diglossia', in Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, eds. E. D. Woodworth and R. J. Di Pietro, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1962, pp. 163-177.

assigned to have a definite role to play, i.e., literary and colloquial. Generally speaking, diglossia is a kind of bilingualism in which a speech community may use two varieties of the same language, under different conditions or for different purposes.

The two linguistic varieties in a diglossic situation are considered by speakers to be discrete, although this is usually not altogether the case in practice, and comprise a standardized high variety and a low variety which is also standardized but may be subject to geographical differentiation. It is evident that the diglossic situation in speech communities is widespread and the relationship between the two varieties involved may be at different rates. In the case of some languages with diglossia, written language has the qualities of a second language in many respects which takes many years of formal education (example: Sinhalese, Tamil and Telugu). Examples of language communities which are diglossic, together with the names used, are the following:

	High	Low
Arabic	- Classical	Colloquial
Bengali	- Sādhū Bhāṣā	Calit Bhāṣā
Greek	- Katharevousa	Dhimotiki
Haitian Creole	- French	Creole
Kannada	- Literary	Colloquial
Sinhalese	- Literary	Colloquial
Swiss German	- Hochdeutsch	Schweizerdeutsch
Tamil	- Literary	Colloquial
Telugu	- Literary	Colloquial

The most important feature of the diglossic communities seems to be the specialization of function of the two varieties, and the degree of specialization tends to vary from community to community according to the socio-linguistic parameters involved.

Diglossia may develop from various origins and eventuate in different language situations. Of the four languages cited by Ferguson as examples for this socio-linguistic phenomenon, Arabic diglossia seems to reach as far back as the knowledge of Arabic goes,¹ and the situation in modern Greek seems to have roots

1. C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli (1972), pp. 237-239.

going back many centuries. But it is evident that Greek diglossia became fully developed at the beginning of the nineteenth century with the renaissance of Greek literature which saw the resuscitation of the literary genres of ancient Greek.¹ Diglossia in Swiss German has developed as a result of long religious and political isolation from the centres of German linguistic standardization,² while Haitian Creole has arisen from pidgin French, with standard French later coming to play the role of the superposed variety.³

In diglossic situations, the high variety (i.e., the literary) has greater prestige than the low, and is often regarded as more beautiful and

-
1. C. F. and F. M. Voegelin, 'Greek', in Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 8 (1965), pp. 158-176.
 2. William G. Moulton, 'What standard for diglossia? The case of German Switzerland', in Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, no. 15 (1962), pp. 133-48.
 3. C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli (1972), pp. 246-248; William A. Stewart, 'Functional Distribution of Creole French in Haiti', Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, pp. 149-162.

genuine, even if it is less intelligible. In Arabic and Greek both of which possess a lengthy literary tradition where the ancient or classical overshadows the modern, it may even be considered good form to write an editorial or poem containing archaic grammatical constructions which no one can easily understand. Although the Arabic speech community is very large numerically, and spread over a vast expanse spatially, high regard for the classical usage and grammatical features are relatively uniform throughout.¹ Arabs feel that the classical variety is the most beautiful, highly developed and the most elegant. Consequently, for many purposes even the illiterate peasant will prefer a classical sounding highly literary Arabic which he only partially understands.² The superiority of the classical variety in the Arabic speech community is maintained on the basis of religious beliefs and attitudes. The language of the Koran has been for

1. C. A. Ferguson, 'Myths about Arabic', in J. A. Fishman (ed.) Readings in the Sociology of Language (1968), pp. 375-381.

2. Ibid., p. 377.

some 1200 years a model for the literary language and is still regarded as the ideal of linguistic and literary perfection. Hence the identification of the superposed variety with the religion in Arabic speech community seems to be paramount in maintaining the Arabic diglossia. Although the classical Arabic is still the predominant written language, colloquial Arabic can now also be written, especially in novels and newspapers, and also there is a tendency for different standards based on regional low varieties to arise in each country. On the other hand, although it is possible to speak the high variety, this is becoming increasingly less usual.¹

The Greek diglossia, though it seems to have roots going back many centuries, became fully developed at the beginning of the nineteenth century with the Greek literary revival.² As a result of this renaissance a literary language, Katharevousa, based in

1. Peter Trudgill, Sociolinguistics, 1974, pp. 117-119.

2. C. F. and F. M. Voegelin, 'Greek', in Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 8 (1965), pp. 159-160.

large part on previous linguistic habits of literary Greek, was created.¹ As the body of literature in Greece represents a long time span, it was possible for the writers of the nineteenth century to utilize words and grammatical constructions of a distant and glorious period of Greek literary history. The divergency between the literary (high variety) language and the spoken (Dhimotiki) is perpetuated in the language situation of modern Greek. The situation created by the separate existence of the Katharevousa and the Dhimotiki has frequently become an emotional political issue.² Also in Greek the use of two varieties - high variety (Katharevousa) and low variety (Dhimotiki) - seems to be closely linked with religious

1. It is pertinent to mention here that in creating an official written or literary language for the new Greek nation, many of the responsible authorities seem to have taken the line that Greek had not changed since the New Testament times, and that all the apparent changes were simply ignorant, slovenly speech which could be remedied by education; the only pure grammar was the grammar of ancient Greek. For details, see C. F. and F. M. Voegelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-170.

2. C. F. and F. M. Voegelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-162.

beliefs and attitudes. In Greek the language of the New Testament is felt to be essentially the same as the Katharevousa, and there was serious rioting in Greece when, in 1903, the New Testament was translated into Dhimotiki.¹

Katharevousa, the high variety, serves as the official tongue of the Greek state. It is spoken only on formal occasions such as in Greek orthodox liturgy, in the Greek parliament and in academic lectures, but it is used almost exclusively for official and scientific writings as well as by most newspapers. The function of the Dhimotiki is more general in that its sphere is in those areas not designated for Katharevousa.² It seems that Katharevousa has been modified successively many times into a closer agreement with the spoken language (Dhimotiki), from which, however, it still differs markedly in certain sacrosanct details

-
1. C. A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', in Word, vol. 15 (1959), pp. 325-340; reprinted in Language and Social Context, (ed.) Pier Paolo Giglioli (1972), pp. 237-238.
 2. For a contrastive study of the linguistic marks of Katharevousa and Dhimotiki, see F. W. Householder, Jr., 'Greek Diglossia', in Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, no. 15 (1962), pp. 109-132.

of spelling, morphology and vocabulary.

It should be mentioned that several attempts have been made recently towards converging Katharevousa and Dhimotiki into a single standard based on the low variety (Dhimotiki). The form of Dhimotiki chosen for this role by its adherents is a mixed language with considerable admixture from the high variety (Katharevousa). Unlike in some diglossic situations, Dhimotiki has a considerable body of literature written in it and possesses several grammars.¹ Under the Liberal Greek government of the 1960's this form of Dhimotiki was made the language of instruction in schools, but with the military coup in 1967, this trend seems to have been reversed - by government decree Dhimotiki has been replaced by Katharevousa in the schools.²

The diglossia in Tamil is quite similar to the above mentioned situations of Arabic and modern Greek. Tamil also is marked for having a lengthy literary tradition which possesses a sizable body of literature

1. C. A. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 236.

2. Peter Trudgill, op. cit., p. 119.

going back to the pre-Christian centuries. There are distinct literary and colloquial styles, showing striking differences in phonology, morphology and syntax.¹ The literary Tamil serves as the sole medium of writing and ^{often of} formal speech making, while the colloquial variety is used for ordinary conversation. The two varieties are so different that the high variety - literary Tamil - has to be learned through formal education. In many respects, literary Tamil has the qualities of a second language. As Shanmugam Pillai asserts: 'Among the Dravidian languages it is in the Tamil the differences between literary and colloquial are the greatest and one wonders whether the two are the same language at all'.² The literary Tamil is full of Sanskrit loans and replete with archaic grammatical features.³ Occasionally, a form of high variety,

-
1. M. Shanmugam Pillai, 'Tamil - Literary and Colloquial', Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), pp. 27-42.
 2. M. Shanmugam Pillai, 'Merger of Literary and Colloquial Tamil', in Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 4 (1965), pp. 98-103.
 3. During the early decades of this century a puristic movement, headed by Maraimalai Adigal, arose which advocated the removal of all foreign lexical items (see M. Shanmugam Pillai, 'Tamil - Literary and

literary, full of high sounding verbosity and ancient grammatical features, can be seen used in speech making, especially in political contexts.¹ It is also noteworthy that during recent times an attempt has been made by some writers to adopt the colloquial Tamil as the medium for writing and for formal speaking, such as university lectures, parliamentary debates, etc., thereby to lessen the existing wide gap between the two varieties.²

Diglossia in Bengali is somewhat different from the situation in Tamil. The high variety, like literary Tamil, is called *Sādhū Bhāṣā* (elegant Language) and is employed for all forms of writing and for formal speech making. *Calit Bhāṣā* is the informal conversational medium of the educated as well as the non-educated people. The differences between

Colloquial', in Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), p. 27.

1. Ibid., p. 99.

2. M. Shanmugam Pillai, 'Merger of Literary and Colloquial Tamil', Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 4 (1965), pp. 98-103; See also S.V. Shanmugam, 'Modernization in Tamil', Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 17, no. 2 (February 1975), pp. 53-67.

these two varieties may be stated as phonological morphological and syntactic.¹ In Bengali, Sādhū Bhāṣā has more prestige than does the colloquial. But the distinction between the two varieties is not radical as in the case of Arabic or Tamil - though the social roles are different, they are not clearly distinguished from one another or mutually exclusive.² It is noteworthy that pure Sādhū Bhāṣā, unlike classical Arabic or literary Tamil, is rarely spoken. In formal conversations like university lectures, parliamentary debates and news broadcasts, a type of Calit Bhāṣā is used with predominantly Sādhū Bhāṣā vocabulary. Pure Sādhū Bhāṣā is the recognized norm for writing which^{is} characterized by a heavy influence from Sanskrit lexis, but in actual practice the influence from the colloquial variety can hardly be underestimated.³ In relatively recent times

1. Edward C. Dimock, 'Literary and Colloquial Bengali', in Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), pp. 43-63.

2. Ibid., pp. 44-45.

3. Ibid.

there has been a movement within the Bengali language towards the fusion of the two varieties. It was Rabindranath Tagore who first began this movement which seems to have been progressing until the present day.¹ According to Shanmugam Pillai, 'there is not much difference today between spoken and written Bengali'.²

In the diglossic situations we have discussed above, the high variety, as we have seen, is not restricted to writing; it is used on most formal occasions such as broadcasting, public speaking and so forth. In this sense the high variety has a formal significance as well as a literary significance. The Sinhalese situation, however, differs from this.

-
1. The Calit Bhāṣā has become accepted as a vehicle of literature in its own right during the last seventy five years. It serves as the literary symbol of the newly arising urban middle class, in contrast to traditional culture represented by Sadhu Bhasa (See C. A. Ferguson, International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), Introduction, p. 14).
 2. M. Shanmugam Pillai, 'Merger of Literary and Colloquial Tamil', in Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 4 (1965), p. 103.

In Sinhalese it is not possible to say that the literary variety (or the more prestigious high variety) is ever used in terms of the codified rules for speaking on any formal occasion. The grammar of the literary language is confined to writing. Because of this the functional status of the high variety in Sinhalese is different from the functional implications of the high varieties discussed by Ferguson. Since the high variety is confined to literary usage only, and the grammar of the spoken language including all forms of formal speech differs from it in a manner that is statable and describable, it is reasonable to say that Sinhalese diglossia is an example of the divergent type.¹

Sinhalese, while fitting the definition provided by Ferguson,² differs somewhat in matters of detail from his defining languages. This difference rests largely on the

1. M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Effects of Purism on the Evolution of the Written Language: Case History of the Situation in Sinhalese', Linguistics 36, 1967, pp. 5-6.

2. See above pp. 9-11.

the rather more restricted function of the high variety. In Sinhalese, the high variety, in its full regalia - i.e., 'pure H'in Ferguson's words - is never used in oral communication except in reading: reading here means a faithful rendering of text as written, which excludes the use of written texts as the basis of lectures and sermons. Thus, unlike in Ferguson's cases, religious sermons, parliamentary speeches etc. are not conducted in the high variety. Hardly a single instance can be found where the participants' social ranking, such as esteem, caste, seniority, monkhood, etc. requires the use of the 'pure' high variety. If reading is not counted, it can reasonably be said that high Sinhalese in its full splendour is not a spoken language at all: it is the language of written Sinhalese.

A thumbnail sketch of the diglossic character of Sinhalese seems to be pertinent here¹ not only to

1. The historical background to Sinhalese diglossia has been discussed in detail by M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Effects of Purism on the Evolution of the Written Language: Case History of the Situation in Sinhalese', Linguistics 36, 1967, pp. 5-17; 'Convergence in Diglossia: The Sinhalese Situation',

illustrate the general setting of Sinhalese but also to show how it is conducive to the rise and sustenance of puristic endeavours. Literary and spoken Sinhalese are distinguishable in phonology, morphology and in certain aspects of syntax as well. In writing the literary language, different symbols are employed for aspirated and unaspirated stops whereas such a distinction does not exist in speech. In the same way, the written Sinhalese has two nasal symbols, one 'dental' and the other retroflex, as opposed to one apical nasal in the spoken language. There are two lateral non-fricative symbols, one dental and the other retroflex, in the written language as opposed to one alveolar sound in speech. Although a $j\tilde{n}$ symbol occurs in writing to denote a palatal stop-plus-nasal complex,

in International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics, vol. 3, no. 1 (1974), pp. 60-92; K. N. O. Dharmadasa's thesis, 'Spoken and Written Sinhalese: A Contrastive Study' (M. Phil. thesis, University of York, 1967) is a detailed study of the differences between the two varieties involved in Sinhalese diglossia. A lucid summary of the differences between spoken and written Sinhalese has been provided by J. W. Gair, 'Sinhalese Diglossia', in Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 10, no. 8 (1968), pp. 1-15.

such a sound does not obtain in speech, and three sibilant symbols, 'dental', 'palatal' and 'retroflex' obtain in written language as against the alveolar and palatal sibilant in the spoken language. There is also a visarga (h) symbol in writing but it is usually pronounced as k or h. It is clear that these symbols in the Sinhalese alphabet aim to represent Sanskrit distinctions in spite of the changes that have taken place in the language since it branched off from Sanskrit. The maintaining of the vowel symbols ṛ, ṝ, ai, au, li and lī is further proof of the Sanskrit nature of the alphabet. Although the symbols ṛ, ṝ are written, they are rarely pronounced differently from the written syllables ri, ri or ru, ru.¹ Diphthongs ai and au occur in the spoken Sinhalese,

1. It is interesting to mention the observation made by A. M. Gunasekara in his A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language (Colombo: Government Printer, 1891) regarding the mispronunciation of these symbols: 'In Ceylon, the four letters ṛ, ṝ, li and lī are respectively pronounced as iru, irū, ilu and ilū and are pronounced similarly by educated persons when they are in combination with consonants, e. g., kri as kru; mri as mru, & c. But strangely enough, the uneducated pronounce words having such letters correctly, e.g., කෘමි, 'worm', as krimi not krumi: දෘෂ්ටි, 'sight', as dristi not drusti. This wrong pronunciation may account for the mis-spelling of words like mridu මෘදු 'soft', mriga මෘග 'beast', as මුදු, මූග. This mistake in pronunciation has taken such a deep root that its eradication is almost impossible' (pp. 5-6).

as in kauda 'who' and kairāṭika 'deceitful', but all ai and au diphthongs are not written with the special symbols (ආච්ඡා and ඔච්ඡා): only those which are Sanskritic loans are written so. I shall give here the segmental phonemes of Sinhalese and the (written) Sinhalese alphabet respectively.

(a) Segmental phonemes of Sinhalese¹

Vowels: a (aa), æ (æ æ), i (ii), u (uu),
e (ee), o (oo), ə.

Consonants

	labial	dental	alveolar	retroflex	palatal	velar	glottal
voiceless stops	p	t		ʈ		k	
voiced stops	b	d		ɖ		g	
voiceless aff.					c		
voiced affri.					ɟ		
nasals	m		n			ŋ	
flap			r				
lateral			l				
spirants	f		s		ʃ		h
semi vowels	v				y		

and half nasals ṃba, ṇda, ṇḍa and ṇga.

1. See M. W. Sugathapala De Silva and William A. Coates, 'The Segmental Phonemes of Sinhalese', University of Ceylon Review, vol. XVIII, nos. 1 & 2 (1960), pp. 163-175.

(b) The Sinhalese alphabet and its traditional division:¹

Vowels: a, ā, ä, ȁ, i, ī, u, ū, ri, rī, *li, *lī,
e, ē, ai, o, ō, au.

Consonants

S u r d		Gutturals	Palatals	Linguals or Cerebrals	Dentals	Labials	Dento-Labials
	Thin or Tenuēs	k	c	t	t	p	
	Aspirated	kh	ch	th	th	ph	
	Sibilants		ś	ṣ	s		
	Aspirate	ḥ					
Sonant	Soft or mediæ	g	j	ḍ	d	b	v
	Aspirated	gh	jh	ḍh	dh	bh	
	Nasals	ṅ	ñ	ṇ	n	m	
	Liquids		y	l, r	l		
	Aspirate	h					

and ṁ

1. A. M. Gunasekara, op. cit., p. 22.

* Never have occurred in Sinhalese. Even in Sanskrit li does not occur at all and li also has a very low frequency of occurrence.

In reading literary texts, one is trained from childhood to pronounce the aspirates, the various sibilants and , though rarely, the vowels ṛ and Ṛ. The general belief of the educated person is that the dental versus retroflex distinction is maintained in pronouncing the two nasals and the two laterals. However, such a distinction cannot be detected in normal pronunciation. For example, the word kana 'ear' is pronounced exactly as the word kana 'blind', though the latter is written with a different grapheme. In function ḷ and ḷ̣ are the same as ṇ and ṇ̣. They are written but not pronounced differently, so that kala 'time' and kala 'pots' and mala 'flower' and mala 'dead' have the same pronunciation. This distinction is purely graphic.¹

There are striking morphological differences between the two varieties, and the most marked morphological differences obtain in the verb - the verb morphology in the written Sinhalese is more complex.

1. For a detailed statement of the subject, see K. N. O. Dharmadasa, op. cit., pp. 75-104.

In literary Sinhalese verbs are inflected for person, number and to a lesser degree, gender, whereas in colloquial Sinhalese these categories are not required.

Example:

Literary	<u>kami</u>	'I eat'
	<u>kamu</u>	'We eat'
	<u>kahi</u>	'You (sg.) eat'
	<u>kahu</u>	'You (pl.) eat'
	<u>kayi</u>	'He/She eats'
	<u>kati</u>	'They eat'
	<u>kannēya</u>	'He eats'
	<u>kanniya</u>	'She eats'
	<u>kannōya</u>	'They eat'
Colloquial	<u>kanava</u>	'I/We/You (sg.; pl.)/He/ She/They eat/s

Certain inflections, which occur in both varieties in identical shape, have different meanings in the two varieties.

Example: - <u>mu</u>	-	Literary	:	<u>kapamu</u>	'We cut'
		Colloquial:		<u>kapamu</u>	'Let's cut'
- <u>yi</u>	-	Literary	:	<u>kapayi</u>	'He/She cuts'
		Colloquial:		<u>kapayi</u>	'He/She/They might cut'

Colloquial Sinhalese has a larger set of second person

pronouns and imperative inflections, which are based on social gradation. But in written Sinhalese there are a more limited number of second person pronouns and imperative inflections.

Example:

(i) Colloquial:	<u>tamunnānse</u>	'your reverence'
	<u>oba vahanse</u>	'your honour' or 'your worship'
	<u>tamunnāhā</u>	'you' (equal but not intimately known)
	<u>tamuse</u>	'you' (equal and intimate)
	<u>ohē</u>	'you' (equal and intimate)
	<u>oyā</u>	'you' (equal and intimate)
	<u>uṃba</u>	'you' (inferior)
	<u>tō</u>	'you' (more inferior)
	etc.	

Literary : oba 'you'

(ii) Colloquial:	<u>kapanna</u>	'cut' (respectful)
	<u>kapanava</u>	'cut' (polite)
	<u>kapapan</u>	'cut' (not respectful)
	<u>kapahan</u>	'cut' (disrespectful)
	<u>kapapiya</u>	'cut' (more disrespect- ful)
	<u>kapāpiya</u>	'cut' (more ")
	kapa	'cut' (more ")

Literary : kapanna 'cut' (less formal)
 kapava 'cut' (more classical use)

The written Sinhalese maintains certain nominative versus accusative distinctions in the noun but the spoken language does not.

Example:

Written: Lamayek āyēya 'A boy came'
 Mama lamayaku dākkemi 'I saw a boy'

Spoken : Lamayek āva 'A boy came'
 Mama lamayek dākka 'I saw a boy'

In forming the indefinite form/^{of}the noun, the written Sinhalese exhibits a three way distinction in gender whereas the spoken Sinhalese distinguishes only between animate and inanimate.

Example:

Written: Mas. minisek Fem. gähāniyak
 Neu. gasak (Nominative)
 Mas. minisaku Fem. gähāniyaka
 Neu. gasak (Accusative)

Spoken : Mas. minihek Fem. gähāniyek
 Neu. gahak

Differences between the two varieties are also observable in the employment of functor particles, i. e., words for 'with', 'or', 'and' etc. There are several particles common to both varieties, but the majority of those used in colloquial Sinhalese are not admitted into literary:

<u>Colloquial</u>	<u>Literary</u>
- <u>yi</u> ... <u>yi</u> 'and'	- <u>da</u> ... <u>da</u> 'and'
<u>ekka</u> 'with'	<u>samaga</u> , <u>kātuva</u> 'with'
<u>nāttam</u> 'or', 'if not'	<u>nohot</u> 'or', 'if not'
<u>yagē</u> 'like'	<u>men</u> , <u>vāni</u> 'like'

Particles piṇisa, saṇḍahā, arabayā, udesā 'for' are exclusive to literary variety.

Owing to these features syntactic agreement in literary Sinhalese is different from that in the spoken language. In literary Sinhalese sentences, the subject word is given in its nominative case form, and the finite verb agrees with the subject in number and person. Thus, the literary sentence mama yami 'I go' has the subject mama in the nominative case - the non-nominative form is ma - and the verb yami has the inflection -mi which signifies first person singularity. The colloquial equivalent of this

sentence is mama yanava. In colloquial, nouns do not make a distinction between nominative and non-nominative, and the inflection -nava in the verb signifies present tense; number and person are not indicated inflectionally.

Example:

Mama	<u>yanava</u>	'I go'
Api	<u>yanava</u>	'We go'
Eyā	<u>yanava</u>	'He goes'
Eyāla	<u>yanava</u>	'They go'

Literary Sinhalese also makes a distinction between active and passive while spoken Sinhalese does not. Generally speaking, it can be said that the passive voice is a literary device which is not found in spoken Sinhalese at all. Even in literary texts, especially modern, its use is not frequent.¹

As far as the lexis is concerned, the bulk is shared by both varieties, but a fair number of

1. For a detailed discussion of the syntactic difference between these two varieties, see K. N. O. Dharmadasa, op. cit., pp. 170-181; 212-230; See also M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Some Consequences of Diglossia', in York Papers in Linguistics, 4 (1974), pp. 76-78.

lexical items used in colloquial Sinhalese is disallowed in literary and a certain amount of literary lexis is never used in colloquial. There are certain differences in lexical borrowings between the two varieties in that while European words (mainly English) are admissible into colloquial Sinhalese as direct loans with the addition of such formatives as -eka 'inanimate singular noun marker', in literary Sinhalese lexical borrowings are inflected in the traditional manner.

Example:

<u>Colloquial</u>		<u>Literary</u>
rāḍiyō <u>eka</u>	'radio'	guvan viduliya
bāgg <u>eka</u>	'bag'	pasumbiya
tāligrām <u>me</u> <u>ka</u>	'telegram'	viduli paṇivuḍaya
tālivisan <u>eka</u>	'television'	rūpa vāhinī yantraya
tayiprayiṭa <u>re</u> <u>ka</u>	'typewriter'	yaturu liyanaya

Sinhalese diglossia, as we have seen, differs somewhat in matters of detail from Ferguson's defining languages,¹ and, it may be said, it has some potentialities which

1. see above pp. 12-13.

may be accentuated for various vicissitudes of puristic and nativistic endeavours.¹ In Sinhalese, the spoken variety being so divergent from its written counterpart, the ability to write correctly in the literary Sinhalese is regarded as prestigious: this is done by the nativists who regard such ability as a mark of scholarship and elitism. Unlike in some diglossic communities where the prestige factor is characterised by social stratificational overtones, in Sinhalese the prestige with which the high variety, literary Sinhalese, is associated is a meritocratic one. Therefore, in situations like Sinhalese there can arise, at any social level, self-appointed guardians of language whose endeavours would direct towards nativism - the purity of language is of inestimable importance to them.²

The major factor that contributes to the choice of a classical variety of language for formal

1. See above pp. 28-36.

2. For details see chapters IV and V.

or prestigious uses is purism or nativism. It is significant that many of the languages which are now diglossic by having resurrected as it were a classical linguistic form have past experiences with some form of foreign linguistic domination which was felt by nationalist leaders as a threat to their own individual languages. This provides a basic breeding ground for puristic and nativistic endeavours. In defining nativism Kroeber says: 'After two societies have come into sufficiently close contact for one to feel the other as definitely more populous, stronger, or better equipped, so that its own culture is in process of being supplanted by the other, a conscious preservation effort or defence is often produced. Such reactions have been called nativistic endeavours or revivals. They envelop with a sort of halo the culture that is passing away, and attempt to reaffirm or re-establish it, or part of it'.¹

1. A. L. Kroeber, Anthropology, New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1948 (Revised Edition), p. 437

In Sinhalese it is obvious that with over two centuries of western rule¹ the Sinhalese people felt that their own institutions were being threatened. The rise of the first movement to restore the Buddhist Sinhalese culture under the leadership of Welivita Saranankara (1698-1778) - I refer to this movement as the / ^{first} beginnings of purism² - is a direct result of this feeling of threat. Purism implies nativistic activity, but signifies availability of a choice which may not be evident in all nativistic endeavours. In other words, a nativist may strive for restoring his own institutions and abolishing foreign ones, and in doing so his main concern would be the fact that institutions should be his own. A purist, on the other hand, would see various possible choices inside what is his own so that his concern would not only be the restoration of what is his own but also what

1. See pp. 54-59 below.

2. See pp. 76-90 below.

is best in his own. In this sense purism is strictly a second stage of nativistic efforts. It is clear that the early revivalists were concerned with Sinhalese Buddhist culture rather than the best (and the 'purest') of Sinhalese Buddhist culture; the search for the 'best' and the 'purest' of Sinhalese Buddhist culture, including the best of the Sinhalese language, came as a later phase. It is this second phase that constitutes the bulk of my discussion in the following chapters.

*

*

*

The earliest available written record in Sinhalese is an inscription of the third century B.C.¹ It is clear from these early inscriptions that the language as we know from them is distinctively different

1. S. Paranavitana, Inscriptions of Ceylon, p. 4.

from the contemporary kindred languages of India. We do not know however for certain that these differences were due to the influence of the indigenous language (or languages) that was spoken in the island at the time of the advent of the Āryans,¹ or to what extent the language of the early Āryans had lost its original character by the time they reached Ceylon on account of their stays in, associations with, the Dravidian territories en route. It is significant that even the earliest inscriptions show the loss of phonemicity of aspirate consonants and show a tendency towards intervocalic voicing: both these features are Dravidian, more particularly Tamil.² It is not possible

1. D. E. Hettiaratchi asserts: 'Even during the earliest phase, Sinhalese possesses certain features which are peculiar to it, and in the course of centuries it went on developing along its own lines . . . There is also a certain element in the language particularly in its vocabulary, which is not traceable to any known Aryan or Dravidian language. In all probability, that element dates back to pre-Āryan times, e.g. words such as āpaya 'surety', oluva 'head', kakula 'leg', kaṭa 'mouth', kalava 'thigh', kulla 'winnowing basket', tola 'lip', pādura 'mat', potta 'bark', baḍa 'stomach', liṇḍa 'well', lipa 'fire-place', and viluṃba 'heel' '(University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. I, pt. I, p. 35).

2. See M. H. Peter Silva, 'Influence of Dravida on Sinhalese' (D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1961), pp. 312-320.

to draw any conclusion in any significant way about the relationship between these written records and what might have been the spoken language of the early Āryans.

The earliest extant literary work belongs to the ninth century A.D.¹ and is written under considerable influence from Pali. The Buddhist scriptures and the language in which they were couched continued to exercise such an overwhelming influence on Sinhalese language that works up to the tenth century A.D., including inscriptions, have a marked Pali bias.² Although it has been suggested that the language of the inscriptions was closer to the spoken language than to the literary,³ there is no evidence to support

-
1. This is an exegetical work called Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya.
 2. D. E. Hettiaratchi, 'Sinhalese', University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. I, pt. I, pp. 38-39.
 3. D. J. Wijayaratne, History of the Sinhalese Noun, Colombo: University of Ceylon, 1956, Preface, pp. iii-iv.

such a thesis. The inscriptions of the ninth and later centuries are written in a grammar identical to the grammar of the literary works belonging to the respective periods.¹ If this similarity is significant, it may be deduced that the grammar of the inscriptional language was never different from that of the language of literature. It is also of interest that the first (available) Sinhalese poetical work, written during the tenth century A.D.,² has been written in a language which is markedly different from that of the inscriptions and prose works and attests a clear-cut division of prose and poetry.

In Sinhalese, perhaps like in many diglossic languages with high literary variety, there have arisen special rules of versification which are meant to govern the linguistic conduct of poets. It will

1. For example see, Anuradhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V (914-923), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. I, pp. 41-57; The Two Tablets of Mahinda IV (956-972), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. I, pp. 75-113.

2. This is called Siya Bas Lakara, a work on poetics, which is a translation of Kāvyādarśa by Dandi.

not be out of place to digress somewhat at this point into a brief discussion of the language of Sinhalese poetry, particularly because there is a close resemblance between the poetic language and 'pure Sinhalese' as advocated by the Hela Havula.¹ From the earliest times writers have recognized that the language of poetry must remain distinct from the language of prose not only in style but also in the number of symbols used for writing, the characterisations of the vocabulary and in rules of poetic morphology. The Sidat Saṅgarāva which has been recognized as the earliest extant grammatical work in Sinhalese is none other than a treatise for the guidance of poets who need to know the distinctive rules of language of poetry.² While the contemporary prose works show an alphabet consisting of as many as fifty two basic letters, the Sidat Saṅgarāva

1. For details, see pp. 140-177 below.

2. See pp. 179-184 below.

advocates (in accordance with the existing poetic tradition) the use of thirty symbols as the basic alphabet. In a very significant way the use of this basic alphabet would ensure the avoidance of foreign loan words in poetry unless they were phonetically identical with their derived counterparts in Sinhalese. One major characteristic of poetic Sinhalese is that Sanskrit loans which are found in legions in many early Sinhalese prose works are totally disallowed (This incidentally is a characteristic of the linguistic policy of the Heḷa Havula during the final stages). In grammar, too, poets have the licence to classify all nouns into masculine or feminine if they so wished and ignore the normal three gender classification in Sinhalese. A poet may use a verbal inflection pertaining to a particular mood, tense, person, number etc. in a completely different sense, that is for a different tense or mood etc. The Sidat Saṅgarāva abounds with examples of poetic morphology of this sort.¹ For

1. Especially the morphological features such as pas perali 'five-fold metathesis', lop 'elision', derū 'reduplication' and saṇḍa 'sandhi' given in the Sidat Saṅgarāva are peculiar to poetry.

example monariñdu navāganī (literally 'the peacock rests') has been given to mean monariñdu navāganu ('peacock, you rest') - imperative mood.

Thus in divergent diglossic situations, the language of poetry develops to become distinct from other varieties of the language including literary prose not only in style but also in grammar and lexicon. Poetry has prestige in aesthetic circles to the extent that the language of poetry where it diverges from prose tends to be regarded as the soul of the language. When puristic movements reach their zenith therefore it is conceivable that purists go for a form of language akin to the language of poetry as the best form of linguistic expression of the community. In what I have attempted to discuss in the following chapters the relationship between the two will become evident. ✓

With the passing of time the language of the inscriptions evolved as languages normally do, and in this sense it might be said that no puristic effort prevailed to stem the tide of normal linguistic evolution. The manner in which the language evolved to

accommodate more and more Sanskrit vocabulary and more grammatical elaborations can be seen by comparing chronologically the post-ninth century inscriptions leading to the written (prose) literature culminating in, say, Butsarana in the twelfth century.¹ We are not in a position to say whether the inscriptional language was in any sense closer to the colloquial idiom than was the language of literary texts. Within the literary language itself, however, it is possible to discern a tendency towards purification. At this time the language of poetry was markedly different from the language of prose in the restrictions the former imposed upon the vocabulary with reference to Sanskritization. The twelfth century writer Gurulugomi seems to have taken a bold step towards imposing a poetry-like form of language upon narrative prose as evidenced by his Amāvatura and the narrative sections

1. For example see, Polonnaruva Galvihara Inscription of Parakramabahu I (1153-1186), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. II, pp. 256-283; Polonnaruva Slab Inscription of Vijayabāhu II (1186-1187), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. II, pp. 179-184; Polonnaruva Galpota Slab Inscription of Nissāṃkamalla (1187-1196), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. II, pp. 98-123; The Slab Inscription of Queen Lilāvatī (1197-1200), Epigraphia Zeylanica, vol. I, pp. 176-182.

of his Dharmapradīpikā, an exegetical work on Pali Mahābodhivaṃsa. This may be interpreted as a clash between a tendency towards Sanskritization¹ on the one hand, and to yield to Pali influence in consonance with a purer Buddhist fervour on the other. It is significant that what might be referred to as poetic prose in Gurulugomi's Amavatura results from almost direct translation of Pali works dealing with Buddhist stories. If one might hazard a conjecture, it might not be a mere coincidence that a special non-Sanskrit lexicon evolved in poetry which itself (up to the end of the Kotte period) usually dealt with themes of Buddhist Jataka stories. One does not however wish to take this point any further because some of the Sanskritic prose works deal with

1. The influence of the Sanskrit language and literature was getting strong towards the end of the Anuradhapura period (9th - 11th century A.D.) and it reached its zenith during the Polonnaruwa Period (12th - 13th century). For details, see O. H. de A. Wijesekara, 'Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruwa Period', The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. IV, 1955, pp. 91-97.

Buddhist Jataka stories on the one hand, and on the other poetry owes much to Sanskrit poetic tradition in spite of the complete avoidance of Sanskrit vocabulary. What is noteworthy is the apparent clash between the Sanskrit school and the Pali school of which the latter seems to have been regarded as the purer Sinhalese tradition (The purity of the Pali tradition in Sinhalese has also been claimed by Martin Wickramasingha in a number of his works, more particularly in Bana Kathā Sāhityaya).¹

If Butsarana and Amavatura reflect a clash between the Sanskritic and Pali schools, slightly later works like the Saddharmaratnāvalī and Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota reflect a tendency towards a

1. See Martin Wickramasingha, Bana Kathā Sāhityaya, Maharagama : Saman Press, 1958, pp. 76-89; 68-75; Siṃhala Sāhityayē Naṅgīma, Colombo: Mount Press, 1954 (fifth print), pp. 87-98; Vicāra Lipi, Colombo: Mount Press, 1941, pp. 10-25; see also Ananda Kulasuriya, Siṃhala Sāhiyaya I, Maharagama: Saman Press, 1962 (second print), pp. 138-160.

colloquialization of the literary idiom.¹ Although nothing can be said with any degree of certainty, it might be conjectured ^{that} /if Saddharmaratnāvalī reflects the colloquial idiom, then there is disparity between the colloquial language and the high literary language as early as the 13th - 14th centuries. The more tangible evidence however for the historical establishment of a cleavage started afterwards - This will be discussed in the relevant sections of this thesis.

1. See Martin Wickramasingha, Siṃhala Sāhityayē Naṅgīma, Colombo: Mount Press, 1954 (fifth print), pp. 138-150; 181-214; Vicāra Lipi, Colombo: Mount Press, 1941, pp. 1-25.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC

BACKGROUND (1500-1770)

The decline and the downfall of the Kotte kingdom after the long and stable reign of Parākrama-bāhu VI (1415-1467) mark the end of an era of political uniformity, cultural tradition and classical Sinhalese literary and linguistic genres.¹ The succeeding period was characterized by political instability resulting in the first instance from the endeavours of rival contenders to seize the throne and secondly from the long drawn warfare among the petty local rulers on the one hand and between them and the European invaders, the Portuguese and the Dutch in succession, on the other. This unsettled period between the 16th and the 18th centuries saw the decline of the Buddhist Order

1. H. W. Codrington, A Short History of Ceylon, p. 92; P. B. Sannasgala, Siṃhala Sāhitya Vamśaya, pp. 240-247.

and the literary tradition which was mainly nurtured by the Buddhist monks and was handed down in pupiliary succession.

When the Portuguese first came to Ceylon in the beginning of the sixteenth century (1505 A.D.), there were three kingdoms of varying political and economic importance in the Island. Foremost was the kingdom of Kotte where king claimed an overlordship over the whole of Ceylon.¹ A separate dynasty was ruling in Kandy having broken away from the authority of the king of Kotte. The founder of this dynasty was, according to tradition, Senāsammata Wickramabāhu (1474-1511).² Ever since the middle of the thirteenth century there had also been an independent Tamil kingdom in Jaffna.

In 1521, the king of Kotte, Vijayabāhu VI, was murdered by his three sons and thereafter the brothers divided the kingdom among themselves. The eldest son, Bhuvanekabāhu VII (1521-1551), ruled Kotte while the other two sons (Māyādunne and Rayigam Bandāra) obtained the provinces of Sitāvaka and Rayigama. After the

1. For details, see H. W. Codrington, op. cit., pp. 90-100.

2. L. S. Devaraja, The Kandyan Kingdom of Ceylon (1707-1760), p. 9.

death of Rayigam Bandara, his territory was annexed to Sitavaka; then followed a period of civil war between the rulers of Kōṭṭē and Sītāvaka. While the struggle was ensuing between the rulers of Kotte and Sitavaka, the newly founded Kandyan kingdom was left undisturbed. The Portuguese forces who were longing for an early opportunity to intervene soon realized that they could fish in these troubled waters, and they readily offered their help to the king of Kotte who was confronted with constant threat and attacks from the indefatigable Mayadunne. After the death of Bhuvanekabahu, his grandson Dharmapala (1551-1597) became the ruler of Kotte, who became a puppet in the hands of Portuguese.¹ Eventually, the Portuguese who first appeared as protectors became the de facto rulers of the Kotte kingdom.² From this juncture Sitavaka was the only lowland native power against the European foe, but within three decades it also fell into the hands of Portuguese.

1. For details see, G.V.P. Somaratne, 'Political History of the Kingdom of Kotte' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970), pp. 372-390.

2. Ibid. See also T. Abeyasinghe, Portuguese Rule over the Kingdom of Kotte, pp. 140-178.

During this time the Kandyan kingdom was at the zenith of its power after the accession of Vimaladharmasūriya I (1592-1604). Shortly before the accession of Vimaladharmasūriya in Kandy, the king of Jaffna was dethroned and a Portuguese nominee was put in his place. In 1597, Dharmapala, the puppet king of Kotte, died having donated his kingdom to the king of Portugal. Thereafter Kandy became the only seat of Sinhalese government and began to play a new role in the history of Ceylon as the sole independent Sinhalese kingdom and also the sole protector of Buddhism, Sinhalese culture and the language and literature.¹

There were four Sinhalese kings in Kandy after Vimaladharmasūriya I and the long line of Sinhalese kings came to an end after the death of Narendrasimha (1707-1739). Next to ascend the throne of Kandy was a youth from Madura of South India, the founder of the Nayakkar dynasty in Ceylon. He was the brother-in-law of Narendrasimha and became king as Sri Vijaya Rājasimha (1739-1747). Thereafter until the end of native

1. For details, see L. S. Devaraja, op. cit., pp. 14-19; Kotagama Wachissara, Saranankara Sangharaja Samaya, pp. 4-28.

monarchy in 1815, all the kings of Kandy were of South Indian origin, and the royal dynasty continued as essentially a foreign one. In Kandy they were aliens, not only in race but in language, religion and culture as well. These Nayak kings themselves were aware of the distinctions and assimilated by adopting Kandyan names, religion and language.¹

Soon after the foundation of the Nayakkar dynasty in Ceylon, it is evident that there was constant immigration of South Indian families not only from Madura but also from Western coastal regions as well. Because of these incessant transportations of South Indian families and their settlements being mainly confined to the Kandyan kingdom, its political, religious and social structure was mixed up with Dravidian elements, particularly with Tamil and Telugu.² The series of royal marriages with South Indian families had created at Kandy towards the middle of the eighteenth century a powerful colony of Nayakkar relatives of the royal family. It is said that they/^{were}so numerous that a special

1. L. S. Devaraja, op. cit., pp. 119-120.

2. Ibid. See also Kotagama Wachissara, op. cit., pp. 22-26.

street was set apart for them in the capital.¹ The cultural impact of Madura was paramount during this period. Not only^{were} the advisers of the king of South Indian origin but also the court ritual was distinctively based on the South Indian patterns, and the language of administration also continued to be Tamil or Telugu.²

While Kandy was under the influence of South Indian culture, the other parts of Ceylon were under a heavy influence of Western civilization which was rather strange to the natives in every aspect. Although the Portuguese were able to hold sway over the maritime provinces, their determined attempt to seize the throne of Kandy ended in fiasco, and ultimately they were defeated by the newly arrived Dutch in 1656. As a result of the conciliatory attitude of the commercially-minded Dutch together with the desire of the war-weary Sinhalese for a breathing space, there ensued a period of peace and reconstruction interrupted only by a brief war in the 1760's. However, the

1. P. M. P. Abhayasingha, Udaraṭa Vittti, pp. 47-48.

2. L. S. Devaraja, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

Dutch occupation of the coastal provinces was limited to a period of less than ^{two}/hundred years. The succeeding Western power, the British, who were mainly drawn to Ceylon on account of its strategic importance, not only were able to take the entire coastal region under their control by 1796 but also held sway over the whole Island by annexing, after a period of heavy struggle, the only surviving native kingdom of the country. In 1815 the kingdom of Kandy fell into the hands of the British thus marking the end of the native rule of the Island.¹

After the accession of Sri Vijaya Rājasimha (1739-1747) in the Kandyan kingdom, there was a faint beginning of a campaign againsts the foreign rulers which was buttressed up by the national feeling.² As a result of the South Indian nationality of these Nayak kings, their position, amidst a powerful Kandyan Sinhalese aristocracy, was rather insecure. Consequently, they displayed an intense devotion to the Buddhist sangha

1. For details, see Colvin R. De Silva, Ceylon Under the British Occupation 1795-1833, Colombo: Apothecaries, 1941.

2. P. M. P. Abhayasingha, op. cit., p. 43.

and to the religion to establish their position by gaining popularity with the sangha and the people. In order to win over the people the Nayak kings patronised Buddhism and to some extent they were responsible for the religious and the literary revival initiated by Wālivīṭa Saranaṅkara which followed in the second half of the eighteenth century.¹

The period from 1500 to 1800 A.D. is described as an era of political perplexity, social complexity and cultural degeneracy so that it has been marked as a dark age of Ceylon history. Due to the internal turmoil that resulted from these political and social vicissitudes, all forms of creative art ceased to function and no worthwhile literary works were produced for at least three centuries.²

*

*

*

Until recently Sinhalese literature has been characterised by a clear-cut division of prose and poetry, producing now an era of prose literature and

1. For details, see pp. 76-86 below.

2. See P. B. Sannasgala, op. cit., pp. 291-317.

now an era of poetry in a mutually exclusive manner. In the fifteenth century one such period of prose literature ended and the literatteurs took up poetry for literary composition. The literature of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is predominantly in verse; any sporadic prose work was mostly commentarial in nature.¹ This was followed by the coming of the Portuguese in 1505 A.D., which resulted in political unrest in the country and a period of literary inactivity in both prose and poetry. This unsettled period saw the disappearance of the classical Sinhalese linguistic habits and literary style, and the elite lost their hold on the language until the beginning of the first revivalist movement of Wālivīṭa Saranaṅkara.

Between the fall of the Kotte kingdom and the beginning of the revivalist movement of Saranankara (1698-1778), there seems to be a gap in the history of Sinhalese literature. Only one writer is mentioned, i.e., Alagiyawanna Mukaveṭi whose works are considered

1. Example, Totagamuve Sri Rahula's Pancikāpradīpaya, a commentary on Katyāyanasūtravṛtti.

by the later purists as 'ungrammatical for the most part and full of decadent and corrupted linguistic usages current at the time'.¹ Alagiyawanna has written several poetical works but not any prose works.² The language employed in these works is considerably different from that of the poetical works of the Kotte period. Whether /due to Alagiyawanna's ignorance of the traditional Sinhalese poetic language or his desire to employ the diction of his own times is difficult to say. But the former is repeatedly given as the main reason in the works of the purists who regard Alagiya-wanna's works as to be avoided by the students of Sinhalese.³

In the works of Alagiyawanna, violation of some traditional Sinhalese morphological and syntactic rules can be discerned. For example, the word kumariyakut in verse 223 of the Kusadā Kava is unacceptable according to the traditional norm. Its correct usage is kumariyakat 'a princess also'. In literary Sinhalese

-
1. For instance, see Kusajātaka Vivaranaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaranatunga, Introduction.
 2. Alagiyawanna's works include Kusadā Kava, Dahamsoṇḍadā Kava, Subhāsita and Kunstantinū Haṭana.
 3. See Kusajātaka Vivaranaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaranatunga, Introduction, pp. 3-4; Subhāsita Vivaranaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaranatunga, pp. ii-iv.

the indefinite particle -aku is used with accusative masculine nouns only and with the accusative feminine nouns the suffix -aka occurs. It is evident from the works of Alagiyawanna that the traditional literary Sinhalese way of expressing the definiteness in nouns is not strictly followed. Consider the following:

baṇa danne <u>ku</u>	(v.88) ¹	(correct usage: dann <u>aku</u>)
himiye <u>ku</u>	(v.134)	(correct usage: himiy <u>aku</u>)
suriṇḍe <u>ku</u>	(v.97)	(correct usage: suriṇḍ <u>aku</u>)
mahanek <u>uge</u>	(v.54) ²	(correct usage: mahanak <u>uge</u>)
ekiyak <u>ut</u>	(v.117)	(correct usage: ekiyak <u>at</u>)
duve <u>k</u>	(v.225)	(correct usage: duv <u>ak</u>)
bisave <u>k</u>	(v.166)	(correct usage: bisav <u>ak</u>)

In Alagiyawanna's works, the suffixes -ek and -eku seem to occur with masculine nouns and also with feminine nouns, and the suffix -eku, it should be stated, did not exist at all in pre-fifteenth century literary Sinhalese. This system appears to be parallel with

-
1. Dahamsoṇḍadā Kava, ed. Walivitiye Sorata, Colombo, 1934.
 2. Kusajātaka Kāvya, ed. A. M. Gunasekara, Colombo; Wijayaratne Co., 1897.

the current spoken Sinhalese usage.¹ Therefore, it can reasonably be said that these differences were mainly due to interference from the spoken idiom.

Several other grammatical features which are not observable in the classical Sinhalese works are found in Alagiyawanna's works. The majority of these features are syntactic. Consider the following:

kelina vāni sidaṅganō hāma saṇḍa (v.24)
 nāti bāvin daru kenek mananada (v.103)
mama enaturu iṇḍuvayi pavasaminē (v.137)
 sutanma dedenek demi metopaṭa (v.142)
 (Kusadā Kava)²

mama nātnam kavuruda tage baṇa'sana (v.109)
mam vāni suriṇḍeku iṇḍa kima vana pala (v.97)
 (Dahamsoṇḍadā Kava)³

In the above examples the nouns sidaṅganō, kenek, mama dedenek and mam are given in the nominative case, though

1. See p. 35 above.

2. Kusajātaka Kāvya, ed. A. M. Gunasekara, 1897.

3. Dahamsoṇḍadā Kava, ed. Wālivitṭiyē Sorata, 1934.

they are not the subject words of these sentences.

In literary Sinhalese, nouns make a distinction between nominative and non-nominative cases, and ^{only} the subject word is always used in the nominative. According to this norm, the above nouns should have been used in the non-nominative case viz. as sidaṅṅanan, kenaku, ma, dedenaku and ma. In the spoken Sinhalese, however, such a distinction is not maintained. The frequent occurrence of this grammatical feature in Alagiyawanna's works seems to be a direct result of the intervention of the contemporary spoken language.

With the availability of earlier works as models of excellence, the written Sinhalese, especially the language of poetry, showed a tendency to lag behind in the process of language change until the end of the fifteenth century. During the time of Alagiyawanna - the period of literary inactivity - there may have had been the difficulty of consulting such models for literary composition. Consequently, Alagiyawanna's works exhibit, to a considerable extent, aberrations from the phonological and grammatical features of the pre-fifteenth century literary Sinhalese, and certain numbers of lexical items which had never been admitted

in Sinhalese poetry have been employed in his works. These changes may have occurred in conformity with the corresponding spoken forms. The following sentences taken from Alagiyawanna's Kusadā Kava closely resemble the present spoken usage:

<u>hama täna gos bata bulatada räge</u>	<u>nē</u>	(v.137)
<u>mama enaturu iñduvayi pavasami</u>	<u>nē</u>	(v.137)
<u>meyin paḷamukoṭa ōṇā kavuruda</u>		(v.142)
<u>bisavek noveyi bala</u>		(v.179)

The words kukul, toran, ukul and kiran are frequently found in Alagiyawanna's works, but in classical Sinhalese these were used always as vowel ending nouns, and the final consonants were considered to be cerebrals (mūrdhaja). Example: kukulu, torana, ukulu and kirana.¹

Several other instances can be cited from Alagiyawanna's works which appear to have been taken from the spoken language. According to the literary Sinhalese usage, the causative forms of the verbal stems

1. These linguistic features in Alagiyawanna's works are castigated by the purists as 'vulgar'. For instance, see Munidasa Kumaranatunga, ed. Subhāsita Vivaraṇaya, pp. ii-iii.

bas-, dak-, añda-, pen- and gan- are basvā, dakvā, andā, penvā and ganvā. But in Alagiyawanna's works these verbal forms have been given as bassavā, dakkavā, andavā, pennavā and gannavā which have been inflected doubly in the causative. This system is identical with the present spoken Sinhalese usage.¹ Owing to the multiplicity of these grammatical features in Alagiya-
wanna's works, these/are not considered as belonging to the 'classical period of Sinhalese literature' but as 'sub-standard' and 'unfortunate result of the then existing turmoil'.²

Apart from Alagiyawanna's works, the only poetical works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are a set of war ballads which, although historically important, are of no literary merit.³ As far as the composition of prose works is concerned, it appears as

1. See pp. 342-345 below.

2. Degammāda Sumanajoti, 'Mahanuvara Yugayē Gadya Kṛti', in Vidyalaṅkara Siṃhala Saṅgarāva, 1960-61, pp. 8-9.

3. P. B. Sannasgala, Siṃhala Sāhitya Vamśaya, pp. 333-376

if prose writing has almost ceased to function. It has already been said that the Kotte period brought to an end the era of prose literature, and the only work produced during that time is of commentarial type.¹ The creative prose writing was not prevalent after the fourteenth century, and this inactivity in literary prose continued for about three hundred years, i.e., until the beginning of the literary revival initiated by Wāliwiṭṭa Saramaṅkara (1698-1778) during the second half of the eighteenth century.² Therefore, it is somewhat difficult to discern the characteristics of the Sinhalese prose of the period between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries and to single out the changes that had taken place in it.

However, there is one prose work written during the latter half of the sixteenth century which deserves our attention. This is Rājaratnākaraya and it deals with the historical narrative of the Sinhalese kings

1. See pp. 60-61 above.

2. For details, see chapter III.

from Vijaya to Vīravikrama. Rājaratnākaraya is regarded by the modern critics as a work representing the then declining literary language and style,¹ primarily because it contains several lexical items and grammatical features which may not have been observed in the literary works written before the fifteenth century. It is apparent that Rājaratnākaraya is not meant to be a literary treatise but a chronicle of the Sinhalese kings and their duties performed, and it is the first work in Sinhalese of this nature. Therefore, it can reasonably be believed that the subject matter of the Rājaratnākaraya may have been instrumental in deciding its style and lexis.

Except ^{for} some misapplication of traditional Sinhalese grammatical norms, this work cannot be regarded as a book written in the colloquial language. It is interesting to notice that the language and the style of the section up to the end of the account of Bhuvanekabāhu VI is different from the language and the style of the rest of the book. The former is much closer to

1. Rājaratnākaraya, ed. Simon De Silva, Colombo: The Government Printer, 1907, Introduction; P. B. Sannasgala, op. cit., p. 326.

the highly regarded classical style and is replete with Sanskrit borrowings. Consider the following excerpt:¹

E rajanō māgē ājñābalayan pavatvamiyi Rajagaha
nuvara saptaparnī nam guhadvārayehi anekaprakāra
vicitra citra karmānta viśeṣayan yuktavu divya
sabhāvak hā sadrsyavu māṇḍapāyak karavā ehi
dolos riyan ghana ran pīlimayak vadā sivupili-
simbiyapat pansiyayak rahatan vahanse vada
hinduvā Buduṅgē delakṣa pansāttā dahas desiya
panas granthasaṁkhyāvak āti suvāsu dahasak
dharmaskandhayen yuktavū sūtravinayābhidharma
saṁkhyāta piṭakatraya Pāli dharmaya saṅgraha
kirīmen . . .

In this part we can clearly see the author's preference to employ lengthy sentences. At the same time we can also observe the author's ineptitude in employing some of the grammatical features of the classical Sinhalese works. Consider the following:²

subhadravū abhadra mahanekhugē bas asā (p.6)
 (normative usage: mahanakhugē)

Ajāsāt rajahata dānvū kalhi (p.6)
 (rajuhata)

E raju kese vīda yat (p.24)
 (raja)

Dharmāśoka rajjuruveni (p.48)
 (rajjuruvani)

E rajahu ikbitiva raja pāmiṇi (p. 47)
 (raju)

1. Rājaratnākaraya, ed. Simon De Silva, 1907, p. 6.

2. Ibid.

Rājanandanayan vāḍa kalahuyi (p.47)
(normative usage: rajanandanayo)

The language and style of the section from Bhuvanekabāhu to the end of the book is different from the first part in that it contains less Sankritisms and some grammatical features and lexical items which cannot be found at all in the works written before the fifteenth century. For example, the usages such as śuddha baud-dhava rājya karana kalhi, māspatā and Kurunāgal kōralayen Goḍagama, Walkola yana gamvalda¹ appear to have been taken from the colloquial language. It is reasonable to suppose that to deal with the historical narrative of the Sinhalese kings from Vijaya to Bhuvanekabāhu VI, there were several treatises to be consulted, but to describe the contemporary political situation of the country, the author simply employed the language current at the time. This may explain, to some extent, the two different strata of the language and style of the Rājaratnākaraya.

After the Rājaratnākaraya, which can be regarded as the last work to contain the fifteenth century flavour, the written Sinhalese seems to have undergone

1. Rājaratnākaraya, pp. 52-53.

some radical changes, undoubtedly due to the interference from the spoken language. The Sinhalese official documents of the Portuguese and the Dutch were written in a grammar different from that of the pre-fifteenth century writings. The following excerpt from a letter sent by the king Narendrasimha to the Dutch Council in 1726 is a good example:¹

. . . rājādhi rājendravū utum apagē devisvāmidaru-
vānan vahansē mahavāsalaṭa pakṣapiramāna bhakti
prēmāyēn yuktava hoṇḍin sādī yedī siṭina kuṁsējuvē
nilamakkāra unnāsselāṭa bohōse deviyo vāḍa salasvā
denu piṇisa penvā evū viparampatraye sarupa nam -
Utum apagē devisvāmidaruvānanvahansēgē krīḍā
parakku kārāṇāval piṇisa dakkavana hāṭiyāṭa uha
mahata āti kukkannen kikkiyannen kīpa denekda
mesēma uha mahata āti kukkulannen kikiliyannen
kīpadenekda yana mekī dē tamunnasselā visin kaḍi-
namin piṭatkara evaṇṭa yedunē nam bohōma hoṇḍē.

The Lak Raja Lō Sirita, a catechism on the traditional laws and the customs of the country and its rulers,² written in 1769 contains a grammar and vocabulary which are very close to the grammar and the vocabulary of the present spoken language but very different from

1. H. C. P. Bell, 'Letter from the Kandyan Court', in Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 118-123.

2. British Museum, palm-leaf Manuscript, OR 6603 (65) 665.

those of the pre-fifteenth century literature. The following quotation from the Lak Raja Lō Sirita¹ may in this connection be compared with its modern spoken equivalent that follows:

Rājakumāravarungē vādimālu bāla pilivela rajakamata niyamayak noveyi. Rajakamata niyamaya nam guna nuvana pin āti bavaya. Me Lakdiva Anurādhapura nuvara raja pāmini Mutasīva maharajjuruvange kumāravaru dasadenāgen deveniva upan kumārāyā mahatvu gunanuvana āti bāvin vādimālu kumārāyā sitiyađi rājasriyađa pāmināvuvāya. Mēvaga Rājaratnākareya yana potē peni āti. Piyarajjuruvō ātat nātat karanda sirit hāti mēhātiya nohot piyarajjuruvanda kāmāti kumāra kenekunda rājjaya pamunuvandat puluvanya. . .

Rājakumāravarungē vādimālu bāla pilivela rajakamata niyamayak neveyi. Rajakamata niyamaya nam guna nuvana pin āti bavayi. Me Laṃkavē Anurādhapura nuvara rajavunu Mutasīva maharajjuruvange kumāravaru dahadenāgen deveniyađa ipadunu kumārāyā maha gunanuvana āti nisā vādimālu kumārāyā hitiyadi rajakamata pāminevva. Mēvaga Rājaratnākare yana potē kiyala tiyenava. Piyarajjuruvo ātat nātat karanda sirit mēhātiyi nāttan piya rajjuruvanda kāmāti kumārāyekuta rājjaya dennat puluvan . . .

The original is grammatically different from my rendering of it into the spoken language only in the use of ya at the sentence final position and the functors nohot

1. Lak Raja Lō Sirita, p. ka.

āti and bavin. It is apparent that by the time of the second half of the eighteenth century, the language had undergone many changes, both grammatical and otherwise, and the comparatively very few works written during this period of literary inactivity provide us with examples of the earliest attempts to write in the unsettled idiom of the day.

The Rājāvaliya, a chronicle of the Sinhalese kings written in the latter half of the eighteenth century, abounds with examples of this sort. Although the author seems to have attempted to utilize some of the classical Sinhalese grammatical features, the unsettled idiom of his own times has overshadowed it. This may be illustrated by the following examples:¹

Gāndharva deviyangē vimānada mavī tibennāha (p.5)

E raju nuvara bera lavūha (p.8)

Puruṣayek . . . satkara labati (p.13)

1. Rājāvaliya, ed. Pemananda Bhikku, Colombo: Grantha-prakasa Press, 1926. It should be mentioned that some of these examples may not appear as aberrations from the classical Sinhalese usage in the edition of B. Gunasekara (Rājāvaliya, ed. B. Gunasekara, Colombo: The Government Press, 1899) as he has altered several sentences to be in agreement with the literary usage.

Māt minisekmi, goḍaṭa varevayi kīha (p.14)

Mama Vēlusumana yodhayāya, puluvannam allavayi
kiyā duvannaṭa vana (p.21)

Ē Mihiñdu himiyan . . . Buddhaśāsanaya Lakdiva
pihituvūha (p.23)

Lamayā eya ādapukala varapaṭa biñḍī giyēya (p.29)

Nandimitrayā dāka diva āvo namut bāriviya (p.29)

Dasamahā yōdhayan bohōse keṭumaṭa nāra mahasenaga
lavā keṭavūvāha (p.35)

It has been seen that the classical Sinhalese grammatical tradition was almost forgotten during this period of internal turmoil, and the literatteurs lost their hold on the language. The most important characteristic of the language of this period is the apparent convergence of the written Sinhalese and the spoken. Except for a small number of traditional Sinhalese grammatical features, the written Sinhalese of this period may be regarded as the reflection of the unsettled idiom of the day. This linguistic situation continued uninterrupted until the beginning of the literary and religious revival initiated by Wāliwiṭṭa Saranaṅkara (1698-1778), the aim of which was to reinstate the Sinhalese culture, Buddhism and the Sinhalese language in their pristine purity.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST BEGINNINGS OF PURISM

The revival movement of Wālivīṭa Saranaṅkara (1698-1778) started at a time when the country's religious, educational and literary traditions were almost fallen into desuetude.¹ The primary and the most important aim of the Saranankara movement, it is evident, was to purify the Buddhist doctrine and to eradicate the misunderstandings of the saṅgha. Before the outset of this movement, according to the Saṅgharāja Sādhū Cariyāva and the Saṅga Raja Vata, the sāsana had been so corrupted that there was not even a single monk to be found who could explain the meaning of a very simple stanza of a Buddhist text.² It was in such a degenerate context that Wālivīṭa Saranaṅkara

1. For a detailed discussion on the background of the Saranankara movement, see Kotagama Wachissara, 'Wālivīṭa Saranaṅkara and the revival of Buddhism in Ceylon' (Ph. D. thesis, University of London, 1961), chapters I and II.

2. See Saṅgharāja Sādhū Cariyāva, eds. Nāhallē Paññāsena and P. B. Sannasgala, Colombo: Lake House, 1947, pp. 20-22; Saṅga Raja Vata, ed. Dikwalle Pemananda, Galle: Kalyani Publishers, 1952, pp. 6-7.

mastered Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese classics and engaged in the task of resuscitating the Sinhalese literary and religious traditions which had been broken during the preceding period of turmoil. Saranankara's restorative endeavour was actively supported by the king at the time, Kīrti Srī Rājasimha (1747-1780). Consequently, Kandy became the centre of religious, literary and artistic renaissance during the latter half of the eighteenth century.

It is said that Wāliiviṭṭa Saranankara was accepted even when he was a novice as a great scholar of Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese.¹ Saranankara's prime concern was to revive the ancient system of education with an intention of bringing the ancient glory into the minds of the contemporary society. Thus with regard to literature and language the literary genres which had gone into disuse after the fifteenth century were re-introduced, and a determined effort was made to emulate the literary language of that period. It is customarily claimed even at

1. See Saṅgharāja Sādhucariyāva, eds. Nāhallē Paññāsena and P. B. Sannasgala, pp. 14-15.

the present time that the golden age of Sinhalese literature was in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the works produced during this period such as Amāvatura, Butsarāṇa, Saddharmaratnāvali and Pūjavalī are regarded as excellent literary treasures of Sinhalese. These works may have been revered even with greater respect during the time of Saranankara when the literary standards and activities were apparently deteriorating. It appears that Saranankara thought it more expedient, and felt obliged, to re-introduce the grammatical features and style of the works like Butsarāṇa and Pūjavalī, if a true literary revival was to be brought about.

Soon after the appearance of Saranakara's writings, the normal linguistic scene of the period was complicated in several respects. Most of the works of Saranaṅkara were written for the purpose of teaching the Buddhist doctrine.¹ It is rather strange to see that his works do not appear to be meant for the majority of people for whom, as one ^{might} / expect, they

1. For a complete list of works of Saranakara, see Kotagama Wachissara, 'Wāliṇiṭṭa Saranaṅkara and the revival of Buddhism in Ceylon' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1961), pp. 172-174.

should have been intended in such an unsettled period

which saw the decline of the Buddhist order and the literary tradition. The most celebrated work of Saranañkara, Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, is written in a language which is highly Sanskritic in nature and full of high sounding phraseology. It is even less intelligible than some of the books written during the Polonnaruva period (12th century - 13th century A.D.) in which the influence of Sanskrit had reached its zenith.¹

The reason for Saranankara's preference for the highly Sanskritic language which had been abandoned after the thirteenth century is not understandable. Consider the following extract from the Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya:²

Śīśira kara kara nikaravarapākara sudhapaddharot-
tuṅga ghanatarovarapākārikā laṅkṛta vividha ratna
karmāntajjvalita dvāra koṣṭhakopasobhita ksīradadi
sikarakāra ati dhavala snigdha śuddha mṛdu puliṅga
viprakīrṇarāga vicitra citrakarmāntālaṅkṛta bhitti
stambha sopāna mālakopasobhita hintalasāra pattikā-
baddha iṣṭikāchadanā gravalambamāna pravālādāma
muktājāla cāmikara rajata bodhipatrālaṅkṛta . . .

-
1. O. H. de A. Wijesekara, 'Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva period', in The Ceylon Historical Journal, vol. IV, 1965, pp. 91-97.
 2. Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, ed. H. Seelaratana, Colombo: Vidyarthaparakasa Press, 1927, p. 9.

This Sanskritism is evident almost everywhere in the book. It is reasonable to suppose that Saranañkara may have felt obliged to imitate the highly regarded earlier works, which had been written about five hundred years before his time, in order to find a place among classical authors. But when we peruse the normal linguistic evolution of the written Sinhalese from the earliest times up to the fifteenth century, Saranañkara's works appear as against the general trend. After the Polonnaruva period Sinhalese literary writers ^{to} seem/have preferred the more popular style, and consequently, they lessened their use of the ornate characteristics and the verbosity of the Sanskrit prose works. The very strong Sanskrit element began to fade away.¹ This tendency continued until the coming of the Portuguese in 1505 A.D. after which the long standing Sinhalese literary traditions were suddenly broken.² But with the beginning of the revival movement of Saranañkara, this development was reversed and the

1. The prose works written after the Polonnaruva period such as Saddharmaratnāvalī, Pūjāvalī and Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota are regarded as works of the non-Sanskritic school.

2. See pp. 54-61 above.

archaic motifs of writing were taken as models instead.

Saranāṅkara has written several books in Sinhalese and Pali which are of religious importance. The majority of his works are glossarial commentaries.¹ The Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, which is written to describe one of the nine qualities of the Buddha, i.e., Buddho, is acknowledged as a great contribution to the Sinhalese language and literature and specially to Buddhist learning.² When its linguistic aspect is taken into consideration, the whole work appears to have been built up under the strong influence of Sanskrit and also of classical works. Because of Saranāṅkara's knowledge of Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese classical works he may have purposely endeavoured to re-introduce the language and the style of the classical period of Sinhalese literature. The idiom which emerged as a result of his determined effort was characterised by

-
1. These works include Sārārthadīpanī, Munigunālaṅkāraya, Abhisambodhialaṅkāraya, Bhesajjamaṁjusā Sannaya.
 2. Saṅgharāja Sādhucariyāva, eds. Nāhalla Paññāsena and P. B. Sannasgala, pp. 28-29; M. Sri Rammandala 'Saranāṅkara Saṅgharājayan Vahansē', in M. B. Ariyapala and C. Godage (eds.), Mahanuvara Sri Puspadāna Swarna Jayanti Saṅgrahaya, 1958, pp. 31-32.

a very strong Sanskrit element but also, quite naturally, by aberrations from the classical idiom, not to mention interferences from the contemporary spoken Sinhalese.¹

Saranāṅkara mentions in his book that he has utilized certain sections of earlier works such as Pūjāvalī, Thūpavaṁsa and Saddharmaratnāvalī in order that his work should appear as a true component of the great Sinhalese literary tradition.² Very often he mentions Pūjāvalī, with also an additional prefix maha meaning 'great', as his model. But it is very interesting to see that Saranāṅkara has copied several pages from the Pūjāvalī without mentioning he was doing so. In these passages he has not left out any single phrase of the original work - there are a few lexical differences only. Compare the following excerpts:

Maha muhuda rala pela māḍa aṇḍuru vidahā
udaya parvatayāṭa pāna naṁgāvū samapanas yodun
lahiru maṇḍalasē ē buddhāsanayāṭa pāna nāgi siya

-
1. Degammada Sumanajoti, 'Mahanuvara yugayē gadya kṛti', in Vidyalaṅkāra Sīmhala Saṅgarāva, 1960-61, pp.16-18.
 2. Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, pp. 192, 213, 425.

laṅgin budurās kaṇḍa harinnata paṭan gatsēka.
Divu divu ē budurās baṁbalova gāsi sakvalin
sakvalata pāna divagannata paṭangata. Ekenēhi
nisā namāti kāntāva taru pela namati gela mutu-
dam pālaṇḍa nilvalā namāti kesvāti tanā dik namāti
hastayen saṇḍaras namāti divasalu vidā haṇḍa
baṁbalō namāti miṇi oṭunu darā tunlo namāti āṅga
solavā kaumada namāti āsa dalvā bhrṅga nāda
namāti gāyana paturuvā magē svāmidaruvangē
palamuvana magulbana pūjāvata mesē līlōpetava
siṭagata.

(Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, p. 267)

Mahamuhuda raḷapela māṇḍa aṇḍuru vidahā udaya
parvatayata pāna nāṅgāvū sama panas yodun e hiru
maṇḍala sē buddhāsanayata pāna nāṅgi siyalaṅgin
budurās kaṇḍa haranata paṭangatsēka. Divu divu
buduras baṁbalova gāsi sakvalin sakvalata pāna-
nāṅga divannata paṭangata. Ekenēhi nisā namāti
kānta tarupela namāti gela mutudam pālaṇḍa nilvalā
namāti kesvāti tanā dik namāti hastayen saṇḍaras
namāti divasalu vidā haṇḍa baṁbalō namāti miṇi
oṭunu darā tunlō namāti āṅga solvā kaumada namāti
ās dalvā bhrṅga nāda namāti gāyanā paturuvā magē
svāmidaruvan vahansēgē palamuvana maṅgulbana pūja-
vata mesē līlōpetava sārāhi siṭagata.

(Pūjāvalī, ed. Bentota Saddhatissa, Panadura: P. J.
 Karunadhara Press, 1930, p. 206)

The section from page 267 to page 272 of the Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya is a complete copy of the Pūjāvalī pages 206 - 211. The other places which show close resemblance to the Pūjāvalī are:

<u>Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya</u>	<u>Pūjāvalī</u>
163	148
175	165

These sections are easily distinguishable because the

language used in them is different from the rest of the book which is highly Sanskritic in nature.

It seems reasonable to assume that Saranañkara has endeavoured with many difficulties to use the highly regarded classical style and many archaic grammatical features which he could not, however, employ to perfection. Because of his good knowledge of Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese classical works he had the opportunity of making use of the books of the calibre and time of the Butsarāṇa and Pūjāvalī. With the attempt of Saranañkara to reinstate the pure doctrine and the orthodox Buddhist order, simultaneously the forgotten literary institutions and the ideals upheld in a more distant past were resuscitated. The use of classical language and the traditional grammar was accepted as a mark of scholarship. Due to this fact his endeavour may be categorized as puristic.

We can clearly see the ineptitude of Saranañkara at using the traditional grammatical rules and the classical Sinhalese idiom. Saranañkara's determined effort to use the literary language of the 12th - 14th centuries does not seem to have been fully successful. It is evident that his writings are characterized by

various features not found in the classical works.

This may be illustrated by the following examples:¹

Piyamaharajānō Sunanda nam veyi (p.94)

(Piyamaharajāno Sunanda nam veti)

Aruṇa nam rajek piyavūya (p.119)

(Aruṇa nam rajek piyaviya)

Maharajāno dun dānayāgē balayen . . (p.131)

(Maharajāṇan dun dānayāgē balayen)

pādayō jaṭāmastakayehi pihiṭṭiyēya (p.158)

(pāda jaṭāmastakayehi pihitṭiyēya)

Mē dasapāramitāvō . . . vannēya (p.185)

(Mē dasapāramitāvo . . . vannōya)

Kosvālihinian lehe gaṇḍin avut lē boyi (p.346)

(Kosvalihiniyā lehe gaṇḍin avut lē boyi)

Uyit terunvahansēṭa bilivū seyin maḷēya (p.346)

(Hetemada terunvahansēṭa bilivū seyin maḷēya)

Ū vannā . . . (p.347)

(Ohu vanāhi)

ek dēvatāvekudu siṭṭinaṭa asamarthavūvāya (p.485)

(ek dēvatāvekdu siṭṭinaṭa asamarthaviya)

ē duṭṭu bhikṣūhu kimekdāyi vicāla kalhi (p.485)

(ē duṭṭu bhikṣūn kimekdāyi vicālakalhi)

1. Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, ed. H. Silaratana. The normative usage is given in the parentheses and the grammatical irregularities are underlined.

These grammatical irregularities may be due to interference from the contemporary idiom. The use of direct case in place of indirect case is a violation of the traditional grammatical rule. But it seems to be a very frequent feature in the works of Saranañkara and his pupils.¹

The above mentioned examples show us that the classical language and the style had to be used with meticulous care to prevent any interference from the contemporary idiom. It is also evident that even sometimes Saranankara, who has/been regarded as the greatest literary figure after Toṭagamuve Sṛī Rāhula, was not competent enough to employ the traditional grammatical rules although he did try to adhere to them. It seems to reasonable/suppose that Saranañkara has copied from the classical works on the impression that his language and style are very similar to those of his models, and he may have held the view that to revive the Sinhalese language, literature and the Buddhist institutions, one should uphold the ideals of a glorious past.

1. M. H. Peter Silva asserts that this grammatical feature is due to the influence of Tamil which had reached its zenith during the Kandyan period. See M. H. Peter Silva, 'Influence of Dravida on Sinhalese', (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1961), pp. 479-503.

Because of the popularity of Saranaṅkara and because he was the only outstanding scholar of the times, there were a considerable number of followers. His pupils were drawn not only from the Kandyan kingdom but also from the Southern province as well, which subsequently became the centre of literary activities.¹ Saranankara's movement of revival produced a great number of scholars with a good command of the classical works. After the works of Saranaṅkara were written, the utilization of the early literary treatises as models of excellence was increased tremendously. His pupils and followers were soon able to produce several books of religious and literary importance. In this connexion Tibboṭuwāvē Buddharakṣita, Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti, Saliāle Maniratana (Buddhist monks), Attaragama Rājagurubandāra, Kaṭuwānē Muhandiram and Pattāyamē Lēkam (lay scholars) stand foremost.² But, as we have seen before in Saranaṅkara's works, their works, too, are characterized by aberrations from the classical idiom.

1. For details, see P. B. Sannasgala, Siṃhala Sāhitya Vamsaya, Colombo: Lake House, 1961, pp. 391-507.

2. See Kotagama Wachissara, op. cit., pp. 226-246; P. B. Sannasgala, op. cit., pp. 412-432.

It is evident that the more popular language and style was very different from that of Saranaṅkara. We have no evidence to indicate that a work like Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya was accepted by the majority of writers as their guide. It may have been kept aside as a work of scholarship until the dawn of a new era of oriental learning during the second half of the nineteenth century when the three Buddhist centres of learning (pirivenas) - Paramadhammacetiya (1849), Vidyodaya (1873) and Vidyālanakara (1875) came into existence.¹ However, the more popular style seems to have been widely used for works of non-religious significance. For example, Saṅgharāja Sādhucariyāva² - a biographical work by one of Saranaṅkara's own pupils - and Sāsanāvātīrṇa Varnanā³ were written in a language which is very different from that of the Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya, Srī Saddharmavavāda Saṅgrahaya and Śyāmapasampadāvata.⁴ This variety may have been the normal written

1. See pp. 90-94 below.

2. Saṅgharāja Sādhucariyāva, ed. Nāhalla Paññāsena and P. B. Sannasgala.

3. Śāsanāvātīrṇa Varnanā, ed. C. E. Godakumbura, Moratuva: D. P. Dodangoda & Co., 1956.

4. Srī Saddharmavavāda Saṅgrahaya and Śyāmapasampadāvata were written by Tibbotuwawe Buddharaṅkita, the chief pupil of Saranaṅkara.

Sinhalese at the time , and , to a greater extent, it appears to have been influenced by the contemporary spoken idiom. Because of the interplay of these two varieties - the classical language re-introduced by Saranañkara and the normal written Sinhalese of the time - the works written during this period exhibit a considerable number of hybridisms.

Saranañkara has not written anything against the use of contemporary language in writings, nor has he attempted to prevent language from corruption. But he indirectly suppressed the employment of the popular language and style in serious writings. His determined effort was to resurrect the archaic motifs of literary Sinhalese. As a revivalist Saranañkara did much writing to propagate the pure doctrine in order to eradicate unorthodox ideas and to purify the Buddhist order. But his endeavour to use the highly regarded literary language of the Augustan period does not appear to have been fully accomplished until the second half of the nineteenth century.

Because of the popularity of Saranañkara as the only erudite bhikkhu of the times, he had a considerable number of followers, mostly Buddhist monks.

By the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century, the numbers of his followers had increased tremendously and spread to almost every part of the Southern province,¹ where there was a politically peaceful environment while the Kandyan kingdom displayed a rebellious attitude towards the new rulers.

With the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century, a centre of Oriental learning, Paramadhammacetiya Pirivena (1849), came into existence.² The founder of this Buddhist institution was Valane Siddhartha, a Buddhist monk who was actively engaged in traditional teaching and a learned pupil of Saranañkara. Until the foundation of Paramadhammacetiya Pirivena,³ there was no proper and well-established Buddhist institution where the revival of classical learning, which was inaugurated by Wālivita Saranañkara, could be carried out. Soon after its inception Paramadhammacetiya developed as a proper school

-
1. See A. V. Suravira, 'Purātana Sāhityāvaliyē Avasānaya hā Nūtana Yugayē Ārambaya', in Sri Sumaṅgala, eds. Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara, 1962, pp. 64-82.
 2. For details, see H. Ratanasara, British Policies, Buddhism and Pirivena Education (1815-1965), Kelaniya, 1970, pp. 190-211.
 3. See P. B. Sannasgala, 'Lakdiva Piriven Itihāsaya hā Vidyōdayē Sēvāva', in Sumaṅgala, pp. 54-63.

of Buddhist doctrine and a centre of Oriental learning, and the immediate outcome was the production of a few distinguished scholars, who, after about two decades, emerged as eminent national leaders and prominent guardians of the traditional Sinhalese culture.¹

About twenty five years after the beginning of Paramadhammacetiya, another two centres of Oriental scholarship - Vidyodaya (1873) and Vidyalankara (1875) - came into existence.² The founders of these pirivenas were Hikkaduve Sumangala (1826-1911) and Ratmalane Dharmaloka (1828-1887) who were closely associated with the Paramadhammacetiya and were the foremost pupils of Valane Siddhartha (1811-1868).³ These two scholars and the chief pupil of Ratmalane Dharmaloka, Ratmalane Dharmarama (1853-1919), were able to attract as many students as they wanted because of the fame they had gained as 'the three greatest scholars who surpassed

1. See Martin Wickramasingha, 'Hikkaduṇvē Nāyaka Māhimiyō hā Vartamāna Sāhityayē Ārambaya', in Srī Sumaṅgala, eds. Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara, Colombo: Anula Press, 1962, pp. 27-42; P. B. Sannasgala, op. cit., pp. 640-643.

2. H. Ratanasara, op. cit., pp. 247-293.

3. Ibid.

in brilliance all others in the world of Sinhalese scholarship and the Buddhist doctrinal learning'.¹

With the wide spread of Oriental learning and the resuscitation of the traditional ideals the necessity for the revival of classical Sinhalese usage was felt. Due to the efforts of these three eminent scholars and a few other lay scholars who were closely associated with these institutions, the bulk of the classical Sinhalese works came to be edited and printed. These were eagerly received by a newly literate public. At the same time this emergent class of educated Sinhalese was being stimulated vigorously into the awareness of a glorious cultural heritage by the Sinhalese Buddhist revival which came about as a reaction to Christian missionary expansion and the general Westernization of society.² The vogue of the day was the spirit of nostalgic nationalism. In this atmosphere Sinhalese scholars, mostly Buddhist monks, were able to complete their task of reviving the classical Sinhalese literary and linguistic genres. Four scholars stand foremost

-
1. W. F. Gunawardhana, Guttīla Kāvya Varnanā, Colombo: N. J. Cooray & Sons, 1916 (second print), pp. 10-14.
 2. See Ananda Guruge, Return to Righteousness, Colombo, 1965, Introduction, pp. xxix-xxxiii.

among those responsible for this accomplishment. They are Hikkaduve Sumangala (1826-1911), Ratmalane Dharmarama (1853-1919), Batuwantudave Sri Devaraksita (1819-1892) and W. F. Gunawardhana (1861-1936),¹ who were able to clarify, as a result of research into classical literature, a large number of controversial points in contemporary literary usage.² This spirit of literary revival focused attention upon books of the golden age of Sinhalese language and literature (12th - 14th centuries), and the immediate necessity of introducing the characteristics of the language of that period was felt. Consequently, these scholars took as their guide the thirteenth century compendium called the Sidat Saṅgarāva, which was originally intended as a manual for the versifier.³ The Sidat Saṅgarāva, however,

-
1. For details of the literary activities of these scholars, see Ananda Guruge, Introduction to Srī Sumaṅgala, eds. Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara, 1962; W. F. Gunawardhana, Guttila Kāvya Varṇanā, pp. xix-xxiv; Ariya Rajakaruna, Sampradāya hā Sihina Lōkaya, 233-303.
 2. Ibid. See also Vinnie Vitharana, 'Sumaṅgala guru parapure sāhityasēvāva' in Srī Sumaṅgala, pp. 49-53.
 3. See pp. 178-183 below.

contained some grammatical descriptions equally applicable to the language of prose, so that these revisionists mistook it for a grammar of the Sinhalese language in general. Several editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, with detailed elucidatory notes, were brought out,¹ and further treatises based on it were written to outline the grammar, especially the morphology, of the classical prose works.²

The idiom which emerged as a nett result of this puristic endeavour approximated to the miśra Siṃhala, mixed Sinhalese, which was used in classical prose works in the 12th and 13th centuries such as Butsarāṇa Dharmapradīpikā and Daham Sarāṇa. This form of Sinhalese was characterised by a very strong Sanskrit element. It was this kind of prose that became the ideal of linguistic perfection for the puristic attempt during

-
1. It was James De Alwis who first undertook the task of bringing out the Sidat Saṅgarāva in a printed edition. James De Alwis who directed his attention to the study of classical Sinhalese literature, firmly believed that to acquire a good classical style, it is of paramount importance to study the Sidat Saṅgarāva. See his introduction to the Sidat Saṅgarāva, pp. cclxvii - cclxviii. By the year 1902, more than five editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva had been brought out. See Appendix II.
 2. For example, Varna Nīti saha Siṃhala Vyākaranaya by Hikkaduve Sumangala and Pada Nītiya by Weragama Puncibandara can be cited. See also Appendix II.

the Saranankara renaissance. Unlike Walivita Saranankara, these scholars were competent enough to employ the classical style and language without any hybridisms and aberrations.¹

The style and language which emerged as a result of these scholastic trends are highly Sanskritic in nature and full of high sounding verbosity. The language of the works written during this period shows close resemblance to prose works such as Butsarāṇa and Dharmapradīpikā which are marked as having been written under the heavy influence of Sanskrit. It is evident that scholars like Ratmalane Dharmarama, Batuwantudave Sri Devaraksita and W. F. Gunawardhana have attempted to borrow more and more from Sanskrit. These three scholars edited a considerable number of Sinhalese classical works in which they exhibited their profound

1. W. F. Gunawardhana, in the introduction to his Siddhānta Parīkṣaṇaya, says that 'the Pūjāvaliya is written in the same literary Sinhalese which we use at the present day' (Siddhānta Parīkṣaṇaya, Colombo: N. J. Cooray & Sons, 1924, p. 8).

knowledge of Sanskrit.¹ I quote a passage from the
Kāvyaśekhara Mahā Kāvya edited by Ratmalane Dharmara:²

Meyin ikbiti avurudu hättāvakata pamaṇa pasu
rajaṇapaḍa prāptavū Mahānāma raju dāvasa svasamaya
samayaṇantara pravāṇa sakala tārṇika cakṛa cūḍamaṇi-
vū viśuddha buddhīṇ prasiddha Buddhaghosa nam
anvartha nāmadheya āti ativyakta arthakathācārya
mahā teruṇ vahanse Lakḍiv pāṇiṇa Anurāḍhapurayehi
Dūrasaṇkara piriṇehi vesemiṇ tripiṭaka dharmaya
sambandha arthakathāvaṇ vyavahāra bhāṣāvaku
Siṇhala rītiyeṇ pavatṇā kala arthaviṇpratipattiyata
pāṇiṇiya hāki bāṇ dāna . . .

where we see the great desire of the editor to employ
the Sanskrit lexical items which had become a fashion
at the time. The inclusion of very long
sentences is a frequent feature in these works.

-
1. Ratmalane Dharmarama has edited, with elucidatory notes, Kāvyaśekhara, Hansa Sandeśaya, Sidat Saṅgarāva and Dharmapradīpikā and has written a commentary to the Bālāvatāra. He also wrote two guide books (Sikṣāsamgraha and Nāmapadamālā) on Sanskrit language. Batuwantudave's works include editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, Guttilaya, Ruvanmala hā Piyum-mala, Anuruddhaśatakaya, Suryaśatakaya, Bālāvatāra, Mādhavanidāna and Vṛttamālākyāva. W. F. Gunawardhana edited with exegetical details and criticisms, Sidat Saṅgarāva, Guttila Kāvya, Kōkila Sandeśaya, Mayura Sandeśaya and Subhāṣitaya.
 2. Kāvyaśekhara Mahā Kāvya, ed. Ratmalane Dharmarama, Colombo: Lankabhīṇava Press, 1915, p. x.

In his edition of Dharmapradīpikā, Dharmarama says that after consulting the Astādhyāyī of Paṇini he has made some corrections of the verbal stems and suffixes in Sinhalese.¹ Whenever these scholars wanted to clarify a controversial point or to classify a Sinhalese grammatical category, they seem to have stuck only to the Sanskrit grammatical norms and definitions. In their writings these scholars use only miśra Siṃhala, 'mixed Sinhalese', displaying their erudition in Sanskrit and also in Pali by a profuse use of borrowings. It is evident that the acceptance of the supremacy of Pali and Sanskrit over Sinhalese and the firm belief that the Sinhalese language could be raised to a more dignified status by employing high sounding phraseology were the main characteristics of the linguistic ideal upheld during this period.

We should also note here the attempts of the scholars like Ratmalane Dharmarama and Batuwantudave

1. Dhātu pratyā nirūpanavasārayehi atīśayin dūṣitavū dhātu pratyā rūpayanda Pāṇinīya vyākaranāya āsuru kirīmen prakṛtiyāta pāminavīmu (Dharmapradīpikā, Introduction, p. iii).

to explain the meanings of the classical poetical works which they have edited. These verse compositions were written exclusively in Elu (pure Sinhalese) and are more easily intelligible than some of the prose works of the corresponding period. The poetical works written during the Kotte period contain simple language. Hence the average reader of the present day needs only a little help from the editor regarding the semantic difficulties. But this is not what we find in the poetical works edited by the scholars mentioned above. Ratmalane Dharmarama and Batuwantudave stand foremost in this connexion. I shall extract the following meaning given to verse 15 of the third canto of Kāvyaśekhara edited by Dharmarama:¹

verse:	Dat. kākūlu pā	lā
	Suratal sinā sī	lā
	Bolaṇḍa bas dī	lā
	Keḷi siyalaṅga dūli gā	lā

meaning: Dantakuṭmalayan prakāśa koṭa bālatvayen
āti ramyavū hāsyayan pravartanaya koṭa
āti mugdha vacanayan danaya koṭa hevat
kathanaya koṭa sakala śarīrayehi dhūlīn
varcita koṭa kṛida kere.

1. Kāvyaśekhara Mahā Kāvya, ed. Ratmalane Dharmarama, Colombo: Lankabhīnava Press, 1915.

The meaning given by W. F. Gunawardhana is:¹

Pāsāṇaya munindrāya mastakayehi patitavana
kalhi kiñcijjñāna nokalāvū pāsāṇayek prati-
grahanaya keleyi. Tadvidhavū gunaya mē Deva-
dattatemē pratigrahanaya nokelēyi.

These examples illustrate the attitude of the scholars of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries who were aroused by the spirit of nostalgic nationalism and who wanted to develop the Sinhalese language to a more dignified and glorious state by which they intended to rediscover the splendid cultural heritage that had been lost during the period of national decline. As a consequence of these puristic and nationalistic efforts, the ordinary man has expected all literary works and even ordinary documents to be written in high sounding classical Sinhalese which he himself cannot understand. A parallel situation can be seen in the case of Arabic where the Arabs feel that their classical language is superior and the most beautiful. Ferguson says: 'For many purposes even the illiterate

1. W. F. Gunawardhana, ed. Guttīla Kāvya Varnanā, p. 47.

peasant will prefer a classical sounding, highly literary Arabic which he only half understands to a pure conversational Arabic which he understands perfectly'.¹

It is evident that the heirs of the Saranankara Renaissance who continued and overemphasized the use of classical Sinhalese linguistic features, particularly a Sanskritized lexicon, had stopped when they reached an approximation to the miśra Siṃhala 'mixed Sinhalese' of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. These scholars accepted the classical Sinhalese grammar for literary purposes, but a complete re-adoption of the grammatical usages of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for all writings was never encouraged. Their primary concern was to utilize more and more Sanskrit embellishments in their writings in the belief that it is the best way to dignify the Sinhalese language.

The linguistic policy of the founders of the centres of oriental learning was later subjected to the

1. Charles A. Ferguson, 'Myths about Arabic', in J. A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language, The Hague: Mouton, 1968, pp. 375-381.

virulent criticisms of Munidasa Kumaratunga, the founder of the Heḷa Havula (Pure Sinhalese Fraternity), who embarked on a dynamic career to foster and propagate what was in his estimation the 'genuine' and 'purest' Sinhalese. However, he himself in his early prose writings uses miśra Siṃhala 'mixed Sinhalese' displaying, as it were, his erudition in Pali and Sanskrit by a profuse use of borrowings. It is evident that Kumaratunga came to the Sinhalese literary scene with the same linguistic ideals upheld by the then outstanding scholars of the pirivena institutions. In course of time he came to adopt 'pure Sinhalese' exclusively, resuscitating a pre-12th century practice and fanatically endeavoured to carry this archaistic and puristic policy to its logical conclusions. This we will discuss in the following chapters.

CHAPTER IV

KUMARATUNGA, THE INCEPTION OF HIS
HEĻA HAVULA AND ITS ACTIVITIES

Munidasa Kumaratunga (1887-1944) was the most outstanding personality of the Sinhalese literary and linguistic scene in the period extending from the 1920's to the 1940's.¹ He was known as Munidasa Kumanatunga at the beginning of his career but he changed his name at subsequent stages to Munidasa Kumaratunga and Kumaratunga Munidasa, each time to tally with a new

-
1. Munidasa Kumaratunga was born on July 25, 1887 at Dikwalla in the Matara district. He entered the Training College for English teachers in Colombo in 1907, and, on passing out, was appointed Head Master of the Kaḍugannāwa Government School in 1909. In January 1917, he was promoted to the rank of Inspector of Schools. Subsequently, he became Principal of the Training Colleges at Niṭṭaṃbuwa (1927) and at Balapitiya (1929). Kumaratunga relinquished the latter post to become the editor of the Lak Mini Pahana, a Sinhalese newspaper, and two literary journals, Subasa (Sinhalese) and The Helio (English). He died on March 2, 1944. For a sketch of Kumaratunga's life, see Kumāratunga Munidāsa, ed. Sitināmaluwē Sumanaratana, Colombo: Peramuna Press, 1955, pp. a-o; Kumaratunga Munidasa, Piya Samara, Introduction by Jayanta Wirasekara, pp. 22-43.

insight into the 'pure Sinhalese' tradition which he sought to resuscitate. He is remembered today mainly as a grammarian and a literary figure. As a grammarian, it is said, Kumaratunga's contribution was singular, unprecedented and, as yet, unsurpassed.¹ However, at the present time in Ceylon, the most widely prevalent image of Kumaratunga is that of a linguistic dictator, a purist who largely ignored the language of his own times and attempted to foist upon his contemporaries the outmoded Sinhalese literary style of the twelfth century together with its now-obsolete grammatical features and lexicon.

The emergence of Munidasa Kumaratunga as a linguistic reformer started early in 1922 with the introduction to his first detailed commentarial work on Muvadevdāvata, a classical poem written during the

1. See Abiram Gamhewa, 'Kumaratuṅgu Vahara', in Sitinamaluwe Sumanaratana, ed. Kumāratunga Munidāsa, pp. 121-151; Vinnie Vitharana, 'A Critical Survey of the Contribution made by Munidasa Kumaratunga (1887-1944) to Sinhalese Language and Literature' (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1968), pp. 2-65. Both Abiram Gamhewa and Vinnie Vitharana are devoted disciples of Kumaratunga.

twelfth century A.D.¹ In this work Kumaratunga has utilized his wide knowledge of the Sinhalese classical works, and, in particular, a great deal of his antiquarian linguistic knowledge in order to prove that the language in which this work (and also works like Sasadāvata and Kavsilumina) was written is inherently purer and more genuine than later language. He declares: ' Although there are many poetical works composed in Sinhalese, Kāvyatilakaya or Sasadāvata, Kavsilumina or Kusadāvata and this one, namely Muvadevdāvata, are reckoned as belonging to a distinctive class. Because they were written before the grammatical work, Sidat Saṅgarāva, these three works were not subjected to the extreme purposeless disfigurements such as five-fold metatheses and multiple rhyming etc. Hence the language of these works remains pure.

1. See Muvadevdāvat Vivaraṇaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaratunga, Colombo: Vidyasagara Press, 1922. Although the Nikāya Saṅgraha Vivaraṇaya was written a few months earlier, it bears no significant views of Kumaratunga concerning linguistic conservatism or prescriptivism, nor does it contain any grammatical expositions. Muvadevdāvata is believed to be the earliest poetical work available to us today.

Therefore, those who like to learn the correct and pure usage of the language study these works with great ardour'.¹ He also asserts: 'It is not difficult at all to determine the learned usage of our poets when collating and examining these poems, and the inconsistencies and irregularities then found are undoubtedly the mistakes made by the later copyists who were ignorant of the pure and genuine rules of our classical authors'.² These quotations clearly shows the avowed aim of Kumaratunga with which he waged a campaign to preserve the language's purity, i.e., the linguistic habits of the authors who lived in the more distant past, and to shape the contemporary language according to this ideal.

1. Siṃhala bhāṣāven nirmita vū bohō kāvyayan ātada Kāvyaatilakaya hevat Sasadāvata, Kavsilumiṇa hevat Kusadāvata hā mē Muvadevdāvata yana mohu srestha paṅktiyehi lā gananu lābet. Sidat Saṅgarā nam vū vyakarana granthaya nipada vīmata pera racitavū heyin pas perāliyen da detun tanhi elisama kirim ādi vyartha prayatnayen da atvanta kālusyayata nopāminiyā vū pada samūhayen samalaṅkṛita vana bāvin mē kāvyatraya-yehi vaṇmālāva paṇisuddhava pavatī. Eheyin ma bhāṣa-vagē nirmala vyavaharaya dāna ganu kāmattō mē kāvyayan mahat ādarayen paṇiśīlanaya keret (Munidasa Kumara-tunga, ed. Muvadevdāvata Vivaraṇaya, p. 1).

2. Ibid., p. ii.

From the very outset, it is evident, Kumaratunga entered into the Sinhalese linguistic (and also literary) scene with a preconceived idea of absolutism and authoritarianism of language use.¹ He began to codify a perfect grammar in his editions of the Sinhalese classical works, basing his views mainly on philological reasoning,² and to condemn any usage which does not conform strictly to his preconceived norms. The great amount of Sinhalese classics (both prose and poetry) edited by Kumaratunga before he actually begins to write a Sinhalese grammar (Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, 1935 and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, 1937) seem to have led him to base his concept/grammar and correctness purely

-
1. For a detailed discussion of linguistic absolutism and authoritarianism, see Robert A. Hall, Introductory Linguistics, pp. 422-423; see also David Crystal, Linguistics, pp. 70-73.
 2. At this time Kumaratunga seems to have held the view that the Sinhalese language originated from Sanskrit through Prakrit, and also he referred to these languages as 'parent languages'. See Nikāya Saṅgraha Vivaraṇaya, p. 152; Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, p. 216. Consequently, his grammatical expositions included in these works are, to some extent, based on philological reasoning, and his attempts to elucidate some morphological problems were aimed at tracing the origin of the words in question to their cognate forms in Sanskrit and Pali. But no sooner had his linguistic

on an antiquarian basis.¹ This was the attitude and the practice he continued nurturing until the end of his career and which later has been carried to its extremist and fanatic end by his devoted followers.²

One of Kumaratunga's guiding principles of editing the early Sinhalese poetical and prose works was to discover the 'pure' and 'genuine' Sinhalese usage and to eradicate the incongruities which he thought had occurred as a result of the ignorance and the incompetence of the later scholars who had made copies of them. He edited twenty eight Sinhalese classics,³ and the number and the order of his editions depended, to a large extent, on some extra-linguistic and literary factors - the majority of these works had been prescribed for the public examinations.⁴

reformatory movement gathered momentum together with the nationalistic sentiment than he radically changed this view (in 1930's) and began to propagate the view that the Sinhalese language (in his words Heḷa or Helese) is purely of native origin.

1. See pp. 141-146 below.

2. See pp. 252-282 below.

3. For a complete list of the works of Kumaratunga, see bibliography, pp. 385-390.

4. Kumaratunga admits that some of his editions were completed within a very short time, i.e., less than two months. See Kumaratunga, ed. Kustantiṇū Haṭana, p. 4.

In his edition of the Sidat Saṅgarāva Kumaratunga clearly mentions his purport: 'By detailed criticism, the obscurities of the verses of the Sidat Saṅgarāva may be understood; at numerous points, the genuine grammatical rules of Sinhalese, too, can be gleaned from it'.¹

Kumaratunga firmly believed that it is the foremost duty of a scholar who engages in the task of editing the Sinhalese classical works to reveal the genuine Sinhalese grammatical pattern.² He held the view that the Sinhalese language was well-developed and highly systematized during the 12th and 13th centuries. On this assumption Kumaratunga has altered not only the phonological features but also some morphological and syntactic characteristics of the later Sinhalese literary works which he edited to be in consonance with his ideal of linguistic perfection.

1. Vivaraṇayen Sidat Saṅgarā pelehi aviparitārtha data häkiya, Siṃhalayehi niyama vyākaraṇa rītiyada sudusu tanhi eyin avulā gata häkiya (Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya, p. 12). See also Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, pp. 218, 220.

2. Munidasa Kumaratunga, ed. Muvadevdāvat Vivaraṇaya, p. 28.

The linguistic changes appearing in the Sinhalese literary works written during the period between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries were regarded by Kumaratunga as the mistakes made by later copyists who were ignorant of the classical Sinhalese grammatical structure.¹ It is apparent that Kumaratunga did not accept the fact that the 'absolute standard' of language use is illusory. Because of his preconceived idea of the perfect grammar of Sinhalese, all variations, whether phonological, morphological or syntactic, found in Sinhalese literary works have been disallowed in his editions, and they have been accordingly altered. For this reason Kumaratunga's editions of the Sinhalese classical works lack, to a great extent, originality and honesty.² He positively declared that when editing a Sinhalese classical work, it was not his concern to compare various manuscripts to decide the most genuine

1. See Munidasa Kumaratunga, ed. Mayūra Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 84-85.

2. See Appendix I.

usages of the author but to use his own criteria to eradicate the shortcomings and to select the most appropriate expressions of the original work.¹ Kumaratunga was sunk deep in his conception of the correctness and the uniqueness of the linguistic and literary features of the classical works and towards the end of his career tried to make radical changes in the literary works he edited. He even went on to change the word order completely in some of the poetical works he edited.²

It is evident that Kumaratunga was not fully aware/ of, perhaps has ignored purposely, the existing disparity between the language of poetry and that of prose in Sinhalese. Neither has he taken into consideration the fact that the language of poetry was so different in orthography, phonology as well as in grammar, and that poets make phonological changes, word

-
1. See Munidasa Kumaratunga, ed. Elu Attanagaluvaṃsa Vivaraṇaya, p. iv; Kavsilumina, ed. Kumaratunga, p. 11.
 2. Kumaratunga held the view that the poetical works Sasadāvata and Kavsilumina were written in a single metre, and he changed the word order of the verses in his editions of these works accordingly. See Appendix I, nos. 10 and 11.

transformations and syntactic alterations to suit or conform to a certain metre.¹ Normally these changes are not allowed in prose works. Any deviations from the supposed norms of Kumaratunga meet with severe criticisms in his works. In this manner Kumaratunga started to codify linguistic norms which he believed absolutely correct by scrutinising the language employed in the classical works, especially the works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.² Until the publication of his commentary to the Sidat Saṅgarāva, it seems that he had been collating the linguistic usages of the early Sinhalese poetical and prose works so as to be able to set up an authoritarian mould into which

-
1. One of the major characteristics of Sinhalese poetry is the extreme laxity in word order, whereas the prose language has a stably fixed word order. It is also evident that the biggest disparity between Sinhalese prose and poetry lies in morphology. Kumaratunga, while disregarding these distinctive features of the language of poetry, argues that most of the word transformations found in the later poetical works (sivupada kāvya) are erroneous. See his criticisms on the words like kamalē, sāvulē, kovulē and avulē in Sālalihinī Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 35-36.
 2. See Kavsilumina, ed. Kumaratunga where he asserts that the language used in this work is the ideal model for the present day (Kavsilumina, p. 8).

the normal language behaviour of his times could be poured to get his ideal of perfection. With the publication of his commentary to the Sidat Saṅgarāva (1934) his greatest desire to set up a prescriptive and infallible guide to the usage of Sinhalese seems to have been fulfilled. From this juncture until his death in 1944 (ten years), Kumaratunga appears to have engaged primarily in propagating and fostering his ideal of linguistic perfection. Consequently, an immediate compilation of original works - intended as an impeccable gateway to 'good language' - was launched.¹ Therefore, the period of Munidasa Kumaratunga's career from 1922 to 1934 (publication of the Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya), I consider as rather transitional, in which one notices more a groping in search of 'pure Sinhalese' and 'absolute standard'.

From the early stage of the linguistic career of Kumaratunga, two, somewhat unparallel, aims seem

1. It is interesting to note that what Kumaratunga had written before 1934 were only commentaries to Sinhalese classics, save for his own work Śikṣā Mārgaya, a school primer.

to emerge: (1) to seek a type of grammatical analysis that would uniquely suit Sinhalese (2) to search for an idealistic linguistic structure to which the normal language behaviour of the time could be conformed. To achieve the linguistic ideal which Kumaratunga thought of as 'pure', 'eloquent' and 'genuine', he seems to have been placing horrendous over-emphasis on the literary language of the 12th - 13th centuries.¹ Consequently, 'correctness' or 'incorrectness' of the Sinhalese usage came to be determined solely by the criterion of literary purity, in other words linguistic nostalgia, and the variations from the supposed injunctions were castigated as 'debasements'. 'Signs are appearing', Kumaratunga wrote in 1936, 'that Sinhalese is becoming a most uncivilized language. . . with a civilized people what becomes civilized first is their language. Need it be said that a people who use an uncivilized language are themselves uncivilized? The time has arrived for us to wake up. This is not a

1. See his introductions to Muvadevdā Vivaraṇaya, Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, Mayūra Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya, Tisara Vivaraṇaya and Parevi Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya.

malady that cannot be cured'.¹ The inevitable result of this erroneous conception about language was to consider grammar as a means of preserving the purity and dignity of the language. These ideas, which seem fundamentally fallacious and insensitive to language variations, are treated by modern linguists with scorn. As Robert A. Hall Jr. asserts: 'The actual facts regarding 'correct' usage are much more complicated than our purists would have us believe. Of course, at any given time, there are usages which many consider 'incorrect'; but 'correctness' or 'incorrectness' is relative, not absolute, in that it consists only in acceptability or unacceptability to a certain group of persons, and may vary from one group to the next. The only time we can call any usage totally incorrect is when it would never be used by any native speaker of the language'.²

Although Kumaratunga had published several works previously -the majority were editions of the

-
1. Munidasa Kumaratunga, 'Siṁhalayē Abhāgyaya', in Vidyodaya I, 1936, pp. 1-13.
 2. Robert A. Hall Jr., Introductory Linguistics, pp. 9-10.

Sinhalese classical works - the incident that brought him into the limelight was the Kukavi Vādaya 'Controversy on poetastery' which took place in 1927. This gave him an excellent opportunity to display his capabilities as scholar, critic and polemist.¹ His declaration that Ven. Toṭagamuvē Srī Rāhula (fifteenth century) - one of the most esteemed literary figures of the classical period - should be regarded as a poetaster and not as a poet in the real sense of the term provoked the entire Buddhist hierarchy and the lay scholars who were closely linked with the pirivena institutions.² Kumaratunga was one of the very few scholars who had no affiliations with the then leading centres of oriental learning like Vidyodaya and Vidyālankara. Consequently, Kumaratunga's criticisms were frequently levelled against the theories upheld by the pirivena tradition. He virulently criticised the attempts of the scholars of the pirivena institutions to honour the foreign

-
1. See Jayanta Wīrasekara, ed. Kukavi Vādaya, Colombo: Anura Press, 1938.
 2. Kumaratunga's endeavour to prove that Ven. Rahula was a poetaster is regarded by Malalasekara as nonsense. See G. P. Malalasekara, Preface to I. M. R. A. Iriyagolla's Dēva Tāpaya, Colombo: Svastika Press, 1943, p. 7.

(Pali and Sanskrit) grammatical works without paying due attention to the learned Sinhalese usage (cheka-prayoga).¹ He declares: 'Most Sinhalese grammarians adopted the grammars of other languages as a criterion in trying to supply a grammar for their mother tongue. The measure they accepted was the grammar of Sanskrit or Pali. Since they tried to approximate as closely as possible to Sanskrit or Pali grammar, their grammatical treatises tended to obscure the intrinsic structure of Sinhalese to a very great extent'.² These criticisms, it is evident, were against authors like Hikkaduwe Sumangala and Ratmalane Dharmarama who were the leading figures of the pirivena institutions.

At the initial stage of his public career Kumaratunga edited, together with elucidatory notes, a

1. Siṃhala śābdikayan visin karanu labana balavat varada nam svabhāṣāgranthayan alalā balā chekavyavaharasraya-yen vyakaranopadeśayan nipadavimata vadā paravyakaraṇa śāstrānugata vima garukota śālakimayi (Muvadevdāvat Vivaraṇaya, p. v).

2. Bohō Siṃhala vyākaraṇa kārayō svabhāṣāvata vyākaraṇaya sapayannata anya bhāṣāvala vyākaraṇaya pramāṇa koṭa gatha. Ovun gat mimma Pāli Saṃskṛta vyākaraṇayayi. E mimmaṭa sarilana lesak karannata giya heyin ovunge vyākaraṇaya behevin mā Siṃhala tatvaya valahannata vahai viyā (Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. ga-gha).

number of classical literary works. His elucidatory notes included extensive explanations of points of grammar, illustrating his main area of interest.¹ Subsequently, he turned to compiling treatises of grammar. It seems that the intensive study of over twenty five Sinhalese classical works which he edited,² formed the basis of his wide knowledge of classical grammar which is found compiled in the Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya (1934), the Kriyā Vivaraṇaya (1935) and the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya (1937).³

The exegetical details in Kumaratunga's editions of Sinhalese classics evince an attempt to cater to the student rather than to the scholar. Moreover, he wrote a large number of school texts - the list including fourteen readers, two collections of verse (Kumara Gī, 1926 and Piya Samara, 1935), two guides to prose

1. In this connection, Kumaratunga's early works Muvadevdā Vivaraṇaya, Elu Attanagaluvamsa Vivaraṇaya, Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, Subhāsita Vivaraṇaya, Sāla Lihini Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya and Parevi Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya are particularly noteworthy.

2. See bibliography pp. 385-390.

3. See pp. 203-251 below.

composition (Prabandhopadeśaya and Prabandha Saṁgrahaya), two guides to verse composition (Virit Vākiya and Kavi Śikṣāva) two Sanskrit text books for beginners (Saṁskṛta Śikṣā Mārgaya and Ibē Sakuva) and three children's story books (Hatpaṇa, Maṅgul Kāma and Hīn Sāraya).

Perhaps this intense activity on the school front was motivated by the desire to build up the younger generation in conformity with his objectives. For the adult audience he wrote poems, short stories and plays. The avowed aim of writing the plays and short stories was the resuscitation of the ancient glory, the lost Sinhalese tradition. He took his mission to the public platform whenever the opportunity arose. The paper Lak Mini Pahana (1934.6.26 - 1936.1.21), the Sinhalese periodical Subasa (1939.7.10 - 1942.2.16) and the English periodical The Helio (1941.8.29 - 1941.12.22) were the journalistic platforms he used.

Kumaratunga took meticulous care to use the 'good language' (as he calls it) not only in his writings but also in his speech as well, and admonished others to do so, too. He carried on a consistent campaign for 'purity' of language through the paper Lak Mini

Pahana of which he was the editor from 1934. The language he advocated by this time was markedly different from the standard usage among contemporary scholars. The most significant point of divergence was the resuscitated ä. Defending the restoration of ä, an obsolete phonological and grammatical feature, Kumaratunga says: 'It is seen that in the Sinhalese language of the past there was the proper use of ä.
 it was
 Scholars believe that/as a result of the decline of
 that
 learning/it had subsequently gone out of use. Some maintain now that as it is possible to manage affairs without the use of ä as of old, it is unnecessary to restore it. This view cannot be accepted'.¹ The resuscitated ä is used in Kumaratunga's works as follows:

- (1) as (inanimate) locative case marker
- (2) past participle marker
- (3) sentence final marker
- (4) emphatic particle
- (5) with certain indeclinables
- (6) conditional verb marker

1. Svadeśa Mitrayā, 24 August 1926, p. 12.

Kumaratunga referred to this vowel as the unique letter of the Hela language (Hela basē veses lakuna),¹ and asserted that it is used to obtain meaning clear and undistorted, to render word-construction complete and pure and to safeguard the essential heritage.²

The other archaic grammatical features that Kumaratunga endeavoured to foist upon his contemporaries are: the syntactic pattern of the twelfth century, the use of the indefinite suffix -ek with inanimate nouns, the inflection of personal names according to a classical usage (e.g. Sumanadāsaya), the frequent honorification of personal names (e.g. Guṇawaḍuṇo) and the adoption of obsolete nominal and verbal stems for the construction of words for modern use. However, he still continued to use miśra Siṃhala 'mixed Sinhalese'. Consider the following excerpt:³

Tarka vyākaraṇādi śastrayan nodat pamaṇata gadya
padya bandhanayan kirime pahasu bava ative. Gamanayehi

-
1. Lak Mini Pahana, 21.8.1934, p. 4.
 2. Ibid. See also Lak Mini Pahana, 11.9.1934, p. 8.
 3. Munidasa Kumaratunga, ed. Gaṃgārohaṇa Varnanā Viva-
raṇaya, 1933, p. 5.

pahasubava ätte val asuṭa yā. Hīlā asuṭa novē.
Val asuṭa khalīnayekudu nāti, sajjāvekudu nāti,
ādda yutu barekudu nāti, māṅga nomaṅga deka mā
samāna ya. Eheyin ohuḡe gamana asambādha veyi.
Hē vāṭa duṭa paṇī. Diya duṭa piṇā yeyi. Vanaya
duṭa vadī. Velāmbaka duṭa pasu kaḍā gaṇī.
Śāstra nodannahu ḡe prabandha karaṇaya da mebaḥḍu
yā (p. 5).

This style where an admixture of Sanskrit borrowings in varying proportions is evident has been maintained by Kumaratunga in all his writings up to about the end of 1939. The year 1939 marks the inauguration of Kumaratunga's journal Subasa (pure language) meant for writing exclusively in Hela (pure Sinhalese). It also marks the end of a phase of the literary style of Kumaratunga. The long appreciation Kumaratunga wrote to R. Tennakon's poetical work Vavuluva (1939) appears to be his last composition in the mixed style, and that after this all/he wrote until his death in 1944 was exclusively in Hela.

Kumaratunga believed that the Sinhalese language was corrupted by scholars who thought it fashionable to use borrowings. In an explanation as to why he effected a change in his own language and style, he declared: 'Of late we have been committing a great mistake. That is, using in our writings as many borrowings as possible from Sanskrit. In the same

manner as it is considered fashionable today to lean towards English. Those who lived sometime ago thought it very cultured to lean towards Sanskrit. Now we have a duty to perform. That is to do our best to emancipate the Sinhalese language. Without impairing our conviction, we must attempt, wherever possible, to use pure Sinhalese. We must attack the mean idea that without borrowing from Sanskrit, Pali, Tamil or English it is not possible to express the thoughts of the Sinhalese'.¹ Kumaratunga named his extreme form of puristic idiom, which is characterized by the exclusive use of Elu (pure Sinhalese) forms, 'Heḷa' ('Helese', in English).² He, in Subasa, once placed side by side the two forms of language in order to illustrate that any sentiment could be expressed in

1. Subasa, vol. I, no. 3 (1939), p. 29.

2. This was much disliked by the general nativists. They referred to Kumaratunga's language as 'archaic' and 'dead'. See Walivitiye Sorata, 'Kumāratunga hā Maḷa Bhāṣāva', in Dinamīna, 14.1.40, p. 4. One of Kumaratunga's earliest pupils believes that Kumaratunga effected a change in his language and style due to some extra-linguistic factors. See V. D. De lanarolle, 'Kumāratunga Munidāsa caritayen biṇḍak', in Sitināmaluwe Sumanaratana, ed. Kumāratunga Munidāsa, pp. 211-218.

Hela form without the aid of borrowings:¹

Sundariya mehi balava. Mē Pāndya rājayā yā.
Ubhayamsayehi arpita vū muktāhāra ātte yā. Hari-
candanayen karana lada aṅgarāga atte yā. E heyin
taruṇa rivi kirāṇayen raktavarṇa vū kūṭa āti galana
nirjhara dhārā āti parvata rājayak'hu men babalayi.
Laṅkadhīpati Rāvanaya da indra lokaya jaya gannā
piṇisa giyē mohu hā samaga yā. Tāmbūla valliyen
parinaddha vū pūga vrkṣayan āti elā latāyen ālin-
gita vū candana vrkṣayan āti tamāla patramaya
āstarāṇa āti malaya sthalayanhi kriḍā kirīmaṭa
pahaduva. Mē rājaya gē śarīraya indīvara śyāma yā.
Oba gē śarīraya gōrocana gaura yā. Vidyullata megha
kūṭa dedenā gē men anyonya śōbha parivardhanaya
piṇisa oba dedenā gē saṃyōgaya vēvā (From Kumara-
 tunga's Prabandhopadesaya, 1938, p. 73)

Yahadasana nuvan pinavan nā. Edi nomādi Paṇḍi
rāja yā me. Halana dala mut'harin dālāvena dāla
yā. Rihiri hari harisaṇḍun mihira aṅgaravana aṅgarā
gat āṅga yā. E heyin taruṇa rivi kirāṇa paturuṇu
kulin depasa hāli hāli dili dili bābali pala puvala
giri rajak'hu men vorajayi. Lakisuru dasasirasā da
daru iṇdiru māṇḍuru dāduru karanu saṇḍahā mē raja
saṇḍa hā saṇḍahā yā giyē. Nimala tamalu dala āti-
rili pātirili āti malaya talayehi, bulat liya puvak
туру valaṇḍi, mal liya saṇḍun turu valaṇḍi, tela
hem liya ara iṇḍunil miṇi tura novalaṇḍi da? Mohu
sirura iṇḍuvara baṇḍa aṇḍuru yā. Oba sirura goroda
paradavana gora yā. Mē kulehi viduliya men me
kaluyehi lela dī unun pāhā pahan nā (Subasa, vol.
 2, no. 19 (1941), p. 299).

Compared with the language used in the generality of contemporary prose writings the Hela of Kumaratunga was archaistic and absolutely free of all borrowings - Pali, Sanskrit or any others. His avowed aim was to

reinstate the 'good language', 'good idiom' that was lost during the period of national decline. This aim was referred to by his contemporaries as an obsession or madness: 'Owing to Kumaratunga's intense desire to shape the contemporary language in close accordance with ancient grammar without paying due regard to the linguistic changes effected since the 12th century, his interest amounted to an extremism which should be called an obsession or lunacy'.¹

In Kumaratunga's estimation, among all these languages, pure Sinhalese (Hela or Helese) ranked highest. Answering a query in The Helio, the English periodical he edited, he declared, 'please understand that the Helese language is older than the oldest of Indian languages'.² In elevating Helese to an exalted

1. 13 vana śata varṣayen mepiṭa siduvunu bhāṣā viparyasyan notakā pāraṇi viyaraṇa anuva vartamāna bhāṣāva da sakasvanu dākīmaṭa Kumāranatunga mahatā tula haṭagat āśāva nisā ē mahatāgē udyōgaya umatuvak yayi kiva yutu taram sīmāva ikmavīya (Dinamīna, 3.3.1944, Editorial); See also Babarande Sirisivali, Sarasavi Sandārasa, 20.8.1946, p. 6.

2. The Helio, vol. I, nos. 11 and 12, 1941, p. 87.

status, he vehemently rejected the accepted Mahāvamsa theory of its Indo-Āryan origin. 'Those who consider that we, our language and our customs etc. are derived from somewhere else do indeed disparage us', he said. 'There is perhaps no other nation older than we. How can we, therefore, accept the theory that everything of ours is derived from outside?'¹ Connected with the above views on Hela language was his conception of the history of the Hela people. He rejected the Mahāvamsa tradition of Vijayan colonization as a concoction of the bhikkhus of the Mahāvihara. According to him, long before the beginning of the lineage of kings recorded in the Mahāvamsa, this island was populated by the Helese people who had built up a great civilization. The land was much larger, extending up to Madagascar. Great monarchs such as Taraka and Ravana ruled over the Helese. This great civilization came to an end due to

1. Subasa, vol. I, no. 4 (1939), p. 43.

the treachery of Hela traitors such as Kuveni and Vibhisana. Consequently, Indian influences swept over its culture 'debasings' and 'corrupting', among other things, the language of the Hela.¹ These ideas were not based on any scientific reasoning, neither they were supported by any literary or historical evidence. These views of Kumaratunga, which may be referred to as fancies for the most part, were expressed in order primarily to raise the self-esteem of the Sinhalese people.

In this campaign Kumaratunga was ably supported by a group of like-thinking scholars such as Jayanta Wirasekara (1889-1949), Rāyipiye Tennakōn (1900-1964), Amarasiri Gunawaḍu (1912-), Gamheva Gunawardhana (1918-) and Arisen Ahubudu (1923-). This group consisted mainly of Sinhalese school teachers whose

1. Kumaratunga's views on the history of the Sinhalese people have never been presented by him in the form of a complete theory in one single work. Instead they are found scattered in his numerous writings and in the records of his speeches. See Hela Heliya, edited by Kumaratungu Samaru Kamituwa, 1961, pp. 71-80; The Helio, vol. I, nos. 11 and 12 (1941), p. 87; nos. 15 and 16 (1941), pp. 124-125; Subasa, vol. II, no. 25 (1941), pp. 392-395; Munidasa Kumaratunga, Prabandha Saṅgrahaya, pp. 36-39; Kiyawana Nuvana, Book Vi, pp. 17-21; See also Di. Vi. Richard De Silva, Kumaratungu Munidasna, pp. 6-9.

subject, namely the Sinhalese language and literature, had been pushed aside by the more prestigious, economically remunerative and socially advantageous language of the foreign power of the day. The only equipment that the Sinhalese school teachers had to possess was a knowledge of the Sinhalese language and, as such, the purity of the Sinhalese language was of paramount importance to them. Not only did they feel the sense of inferiority as a result of foreign linguistic domination but also they realized the growing insecurity to their profession. It was in this socio-economic context, wherein education in Sinhalese brought meagre economic rewards, that Kumaratunga raised the battle cry for 'pure Sinhalese' and made constant appeal to the School teachers. 'There are now and then gentlemen teachers distinguishable by their piercing proficiency, indomitable courage and stout determination', said Kumaratunga. 'Their number is not large but is ever on the increase. The time is ripe for these valiant upholders of national traditions and cultural standards to go a step beyond the firm stand they are already making. They must now advance. So

far they have defended themselves. Now they must take the initiative as well as the offensive into their hands'.¹

As ^{was} /to be expected, the majority of followers of Kumaratunga were vernacular teachers and were his own pupils. As has been mentioned,² Kumaratunga himself was a teacher (1909-1917), a school inspector (1917-1922) and the principal of two teachers' training colleges - Nittambuwa (1927-1929) and Balapitiya (1929-1930). His followers were mainly drawn from these institutions. It appears that not only were those followers of Kumaratunga vernacular teachers but also the prominent members of his fraternity belonged to the same locality as that of Kumaratunga.³ However, only three Buddhist monks appear to have taken part in the

1. The Helio, vol. I, nos. 9 and 10, 1941, p. 70.

2. See p. 103, foot note 1.

3. Kumaratunga was born at Dikwälla in the Matara district in the Southern Province. Except R. Tennakōn, almost all of his devoted disciples belonged to this area. For details, see pp. 252-277 below.

at first.¹
Hela movement/ This was in spite of the opposition
 of almost the entire hierarchy of the Buddhist clergy
 to the Hela movement.

the
 It was when/campaign seemed to be making a
 considerable impact on society that Kumaratunga em-
 barked on the project of establishing organizations.
 The first attempt of Kumaratunga to establish an orga-
 nization was the founding of the Siṃhala Samājaya 'The
 Sinhalese Society' in 1935. This association seems to
 have died out soon after, without any achievement to its
 credit.² It was during the early 1940's when his
 journals Subasa and The Helio were exerting considerable
 influence on society that Kumaratunga founded one of
 the most dynamic organizations of the time, The Hela
Havula 'The Pure Sinhalese Fraternity'.³ The theme of
 Kumaratunga's address to the inaugural meeting of the
Hela Havula (11 January 1941) was that in order to

1. They were Ven. Kodagoda Ñāṇāloka, Ven. Warakāgoḍa
 Sīlaratana and Ven. Polhene Ñāṇālaṅkara. Among
 these only Kodagoda Nanaloka took an active part
 in the Hela movement.

2. See Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Hela Vata, pp. 148-149.

3. The inaugural meeting was held at Kumaratunga's
 home in Panadura on 11th January 1941. See Amarasiri
 Gunawadu, Maha Hela Vata, pp. 150-152.

uplift a nation the primary step that should be taken was the improvement of its language. 'It is beyond the capabilities of a single individual to develop a country', he said, 'or to develop a language. Therefore, let us form an association, create branches all over the country and win over the Hela to our cause'.¹ With this as its aim the Hela Havula movement soon gathered momentum. Branch organizations sprouted at Matara, Kalutara, Gampaha, Kandy, Kagalla, Ratnapura and Bandarawela.² The Hela Havula was a unique organization in that it had no patron or president. Its only office bearers were two organizers and a committee of seven. When a meeting was summoned a chairman was elected for the occasion.³

The Hela Havula 'The Pure Sinhalese Fraternity' of under the leadership/Kumaratunga was making great headway soon after its inception.⁴ Although numerically not very large, the membership of the Hela Havula

-
1. See the report given in Subasa, vol. II, no. 18, pp. 278-279.
 2. Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Hela Vata, pp. 153-154.
 3. Ibid., p. 150. The first two organizers or the chief whips were Jayanta Wīrasekara and R. Tennakōn.
 4. See Subasa, vol. III for reports of the intensive activity of the Hela Havula.

comprised dedicated and energetic literati. The Hela Havula, in pursuance of its linguistic policy, let off a fusillade of criticism at the theories upheld by the pirivena tradition. 'The pundits of the temple and the university', wrote Kumaratunga, 'have created a language of their own which is at once debased, insipid and inelegant'.¹ The Hela Havula's criticisms had also found a target in the corruptions of the contemporary Buddhist church as well. In an article written in 1942 entitled 'The disservice we are doing to religion', Jayanta Wīrasekara castigates the blind faith of the average Buddhist devotee who venerates even impious monks, just because they happen to wear yellow robes.² It is also significant that in place of the slogan rāṭa, jāṭiya, āgama 'country, nation and religion', proclaimed by the traditionalist elite of the day, the Hela Havula exhorted the adoption

1. See The Helio, vol. I, no. 17, nos. 13 and 14 (1941), pp. 104-105. Also see Kumaratunga's attacks on scholar monks / ^{like} Walivitiye Sorata and Bambarande Sirisivali in a number instances in Subasa, vol. III, no. 11 (1941); nos. 23 and 24 (1941).

2. See Subasa, vol. III no. 36 (1942), p. 35.

of basa, rāsa, desa 'language, nation and country'. It is important to note that 'religion' has been replaced by 'language' and that 'language' has been placed foremost. To the Hela Havula basa, rāsa and desa were the Triple Gem (Tun Ruvan), and, consequently, these three words became the key slogan of the Hela movement.¹ These unorthodox pronouncements of the Hela Havula contributed to the precipitation of a head-on clash between them and the Buddhist hierarchy.²

The leaders who came under the virulent criticisms of the Hela Havula were 'Men who do not know our language well enough to write a good essay in it . . . (but) . . . pose as the highest scholars . . . (and) . . . those in authority who allow this state of affairs to continue'.³ In Subasa and the Helio there are numerous instances when the dons of the

1. The members of the Hela Havula constantly maintained the practice of using the phrase Hela basa, Hela rāsa, Hela desa yana tunuruvana nāmaṇḍā 'having paid respects to the Triple Gem Hela language, Hela nation and the land of Hela' at the beginning of their works. This is quite contrary to the traditional practice.

2. See Arisen Ahubudu, Kumaratuṅgu Āsura, pp. x-xiii.

3. The Helio, vol. I, no. 11 (1941), the Editorial.

university, especially those of the Oriental Section, and the editorial board of the Sinhalese Dictionary are blamed for debasing the Hela language.¹ In an editorial to The Helio, entitled 'Doctoring to Death' - the reference being to Professor G. P. Malalasekara, Head of the Department of Indo-Aryan Studies, University of Ceylon - Kumaratunga says: 'No less a person that Dr. G. P. Malalasekara, member of the Text Book Committee, has boldly, unhesitatingly and publicly announced that "The Committee did not pay much attention to errors in the spacing of words, grammar and spelling". G. P. Malalasekara we must all admit is the accredited official authority on Sin-Helese (sic) language and is it a wonder if that language, under his distinguished direction, became grammarless, styleless, powerless, vigourless and graceless and suitable only to the gutter?'² Over the Dictionary issue, making

1. See Subasa, vol. II, no. 6; vol. II, no. 8; vol. II, no. 23; The Helio, vol. I, nos. 7 and 8 (1941), p. 50; vol. I, nos. 13 and 14 (1941), p. 106.

2. The Helio, vol. I, nos. 7 and 8 (1941), p. 50.

'an open appeal' in The Helio to D. B. Jayatilaka, a renowned Oriental scholar who also happened to be the Editor-in-Chief of the Sinhalese Dictionary, the Hela Havula says: 'The Sinhalese language is trying its best to get itself freed. It has a right to ask for your assistance. But ^{what} assistance are you rendering it at present? Instead of rendering it every assistance to free itself from bondage you yourself are supposed to be holding it tight. . .'¹ This section of the power elite which came under the virulent criticism of the Hela Havula was closely linked with the then leading pirivenas like Vidyodaya and Vidyalkankara.

It is evident that the determined effort of the Hela Havula was to raise the Sinhalese language to the status of a cause and a mission. Their contention was that the Sinhalese language had deteriorated during the period of national decline and that this factor lay at the root of all the ills that beset the nation: 'A base, corrupted, inelegant and insipid

1. Subasa, vol. II, no. 17 (1941), p. 50.

language', Kumaratunga said, 'will produce a mean and miserable mentality'.¹ Reproaching the Department of Education with a desire to produce people with a slavish mentality, the Hela Havula says:

'The Department has done and are still doing everything to make the language lawless, graceless, powerless and worthless. Language without dignity produces men and women without dignity. Men and women without dignity are as base as beasts and can be made to stoop to any meanness'.² Thus according to the Hela Havula, the first step in the struggle for freedom was the adoption of 'pure language' which would consequently lead to the growth of a free and independent national spirit.

While letting off volleys of criticisms at almost every educational institution at the time, the Hela Havula started to produce their^{own}/creative works to show that the Helese language has to be used exclusively, if a true and genuine literary tradition has

1. The Helio, vol. I, nos. 9 and 10, 1941, p. 74.

2. The Helio, vol. I, nos. 13 and 14, The Editorial.

to be brought about. Among the devoted members of this group, R. Tennakon was encouraged and persuaded to engage in this onerous task of revealing and elevating the lost Helese poetical tradition. Consequently, Tennakon wrote three, somewhat lengthy, poetical works - Vavuluva (1939), Hävillla (1940) and Dä Vinaya (1940) which were accompanied by long literary appreciations by Kumaratunga and detailed commentaries by Jayanta Wirasekara.¹ However, it seems that during the first three years after the inauguration of the Hela Havula its works were mainly confined to writing open letters to important personalities, organizing debates and public meetings and holding anniversary convocations. Since the emphasis was focussed particularly on the missionary aspect of the Hela movement, only its leading members could produce comparatively/a very few works, including the leader, Kumaratunga.²

1. For details, see pp. 257-266 below.

2. Kumaratunga wrote only three works during the period 1941-1944. They were Hela Miyäsiya (a treatise on music), Ibē Sakuva (Sanskrit text book for beginners) and the edition of Kav Silumina. Apart from R. Tennakon's above mentioned works, there are only two works written during this period, i.e., Warakagoda Silaratana's Lamā Viruva (1941) and Jayamaha Wellala's Ali Saturuva (1942).

As reports in Subasa and The Helio show, the Hela Havula under the leadership of Kumaratunga was making great headway soon after its inception. It is apparent that Kumaratunga was the main sustainer of the movement. By the year 1943, according to the Subasa, the membership of the Hela Havula had increased to sixty and the number of sympathizers with the Helese linguistic doctrine also had increased tremendously.¹ However, as the leading members of the Hela movement only eighteen names have been given. They were Munidasa Kumaratunga (leader), Jayanta Wirasekara, R. Tennakon (chief whips), Abiram Gamhewa, Amarasiri Gunawardhana, Arisen Ahubudu, Ven. Kodagoda Nanaloka, Ven. Warakagoda Silaratana, Ven. Talpawila Minidonu, Jayamaha Wellala, Gamhewa Gunawardhana, M. V. Perera, Mohotti Donu Davidu, Gunapala Senadhira, W. V. Abayagunawardhana, Kitsiri Kumarasingha, Moses Perera and Samarakon Vajirasena.² Although it appears that a considerable section of the Sinhalese educated youth

1. See Subasa, vol. III, no. 34, p. 46; The Helio, vol. I, nos. 15-16, p. 120.

2. See Subasa, vol. III, no. 34, p. 46-47.

(mainly the Sinhalese school teachers) was drawn into the Hela movement, after the removal of Kumara-tunga's charismatic leadership with his sudden death in 1944 - three years after the inauguration of the Hela Havula, it entered on the path of gradual decline.

CHAPTER V

LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE HELA HAVULA

The theme of Kumaratunga's address to the inaugural meeting of the Hela Havula is of much importance for understanding the linguistic philosophy of Kumaratunga, and, later, of his disciples, and also to estimate his endeavour to reinstate what was deemed to be the pure language. Kumaratunga declared: 'In order to uplift a nation, the primary step that should be taken is the improvement of its language'.¹ His contention was that the Sinhalese language was corrupted by the scholars who thought it fashionable to use foreign linguistic elements. 'Sinhalese is becoming a most uncivilized and undignified language', said Kumaratunga. 'With a civilized people what becomes civilized first is their language. Need

1. Subasa, vol. II, no. 18, pp. 278-279; reproduced in Hela Heliya, ed. by Kumaratunga Samaru Kamituva, 1961, pp. 75-76.

it be said that a people who use an uncivilized language are themselves uncivilized? . . . The time has arrived for us to make up. We must attempt, wholeheartedly, to forestall this decline'.¹

Kumaratunga's aim was to restore the linguistic usages of a distant past which he embraced as 'absolutely correct' and 'inherently pure' and to shape the language of his own times accordingly.

To Munidasa Kumaratunga, and also to his devoted followers, the contemporary Sinhalese language was a degenerated, corrupted and grammarless medium which should never be taught or employed in any serious writings. The following quotation will sufficiently illustrate Kumaratunga's attitude towards the linguistic habits of his own times: 'At the present day the Sinhalese language is like a dense forest. Those who wish to cross it clear their own paths. How mean are those who are bereft of that manliness to realize

1. See Hela Heliya, pp. 6-7.

the need for the construction or the facilitating of the construction of a broad and pleasing highway through this forest for the use of all. 'All' here is used in the particular sense to mean all those who are really equipped for the journey. The crippled, the backboneless, the blind and others of this type are not eligible to this class. When we speak of a 'language that everyone' can use, the term everyone includes those who realize that a language should be cultured, grammatical and forceful. The rest are not included. Yet, there are those at the present day who are of opinion that the Sinhalese language should be so simplified that it may be easily understood even by a Negro who came from Africa only the other day'.¹ He was firmly opposed to the idea that 'Correctness of linguistic usage should be determined by the criterion of majority usage'.² Kumaratunga firmly

(written in English)

1. Mayūra Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya, p. 85/; See also Subaśa, vol. I, no. 3 (1939), p. 29; no. 4, p. 43; The Helio, vol. I, nos. 11 and 12 (1941), p. 87.
2. Bhāṣā vyavahāraya vādi denāgē vedum anuva viya yutuya. See Kumaratunga's criticisms on this in Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, p. 46; Mayūra Sandeśa Vivaraṇaya, p. 82; Gaṅgārohana Varnanā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 6-7.

believed that language is preserved by the usage of educated and careful people and changed by the corruptions of the vulgar.¹ Because of Kumaratunga's ultra-conservative viewpoint of grammar, he thought it was the first and the foremost task of the grammarian to prescribe not only how people ought to write but also how people ought to speak.² These deep-rooted misconceptions prevented him from looking at the Sinhalese language from the proper perspective.

As a result of Kumaratunga's unbounded faith in the 'correctness' of the classical Sinhalese literary treatises, especially the works like Sasadāvata, Kav-silumiṇa and Amāvatura,³ and his firm belief that the classical Sinhalese is the only valid kind of linguistic structure, his notion of 'grammar' was inevitably conceived on this antiquarian base. In his texts, the

-
1. Gaṅgārohaṇa Varnanā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 6-7. This is the kind of concept held by the eighteenth century European grammarians on 'language' and 'grammar'. For details, see L. Bloomfield, Language, pp. 3-9; David Crystal, Linguistics, pp. 10-37; John Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, pp. 4-20.
 2. See Subhāṣita Vivaraṇaya, pp. ii-iii.
 3. See pp. 105-106 above.

term viyarana or vyākaraṇa 'grammar' came to mean a set of rules (rather injunctions) derived from the classical Sinhalese usage,¹ and being unable to force the current Sinhalese language, especially the spoken, into this prescriptive mould, Kumaratunga/^{has}concluded that it has no grammar. Kumaratunga's notion of grammar so conceived is fundamentally fallacious, and it is antagonistic towards the modern idea that 'language can never be subjected to the dicta of any one person, and the 'correctness' or 'incorrectness' of linguistic matters determined by any other criterion except that of social acceptability'.² It is prudent for a grammarian to consider the written language and the spoken as two distinct systems of communication, but Kumaratunga, ignoring the registeral differences and stylistic variations of Sinhalese, has fallen into what David Crystal describes as

-
1. Bhāṣāveka vyākaraṇaya nam tadbhāṣāgata śiṣṭaprayōgayaṅgē vargakaraṇādiya yi 'Grammar of a language is the analysis of its learned usages' (Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya, p. 228).
 2. For a detailed discussion of 'social acceptability' in language, see Robert A. Hall, Jr., Introductory Linguistics, pp. 444-445.

'the trap of always looking at one aspect through the eyes of ^{the} other'.¹ This is the case more particularly with the followers of Kumaratunga.

Linguistic purism, for which Kumaratunga is known best, was not for him an end in itself. In his opinion it was the means to build up a cultured and strong nation. A devoted disciple of Kumaratunga writing his biography, entitled Maha Hela Vata, asserts: 'It is accepted by learned scholars that the life-blood of a nation is its language. This is a universal truth. Munidas (Kumaratunga) who also believed it wholeheartedly, surveyed the world with his keen intellect, taking guidance from history. What he saw everywhere was that whenever language became weak (dumbul) the nation deteriorated. To Munidas who pondered over the past and the present of the Helese nation, one truth became obvious. That is, the one unmistakable way of fortifying the nation was to fortify the language'.² This statement clearly reveals the basis of Helese linguistic doctrine.

1. David Crystal, Linguistics, p. 60.

2. Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Hela Vata, p. 87.

It is evident that Kumaratunga's concept of language and grammar is entangled with his belief in the pristine glory and the purity of the classical Sinhalese usage, and, as a consequence, his views represent largely a distorted version of the function of human language. Kumaratunga's notion of grammar was never connected with the actual linguistic habits of contemporary society, but with the written documents of a more distant past. What he conceived as the 'grammar' of a language, it appears, is highly complicated and difficult to understand. To quote one example, Kumaratunga, in his Kiyavana Nuvana - a school reader intended for the third and fourth forms - describes a grammar of a language as 'clothes for the civilized people as against the animals who have not even a single thread'.¹ In this work there is also a whole story written for the purpose of ridiculing the prevailing idea of grammar

1. Ek huyakudu āṅgehi - nogat tirisanun'atara da saluva nohalati utumō - viyaranaya men sukiyin (Kiyavana Nuvana, p. 42).

as an analysis of the actual usage.¹ In Prabandha Saṅgrahaya, a collection of essays on 'good writing', Kumaratunga compares language with a garden, which seems quite absurd.² The frequent use of hypothetical situations in order to highlight his dogmatic prescriptions and antiquated shibboleths of language is prominent in almost all the works of Kumaratunga.³ His attention has never been focussed on the functions of language or its intrinsic potentialities, and for him, 'to examine how our language is spoken and written; how it is constructed and how it functions' is meaningless, and sometimes intolerable.⁴ 'It is indeed encouraging to see the attempt of the young teachers to speak in grammatical language', says Kumaratunga.⁵ Here what he means by 'grammatical' is

-
1. This story is entitled Kātat Hākiyāwa which means 'Everyone is competent'. See Kiyawana Nuvana, pp. 114-121.
 2. Bhaṣāva vattak vāniyayi kiyā hāki (Prabandha Saṅgrahaya, p. 173).
 3. For instance, see Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. ka-kha; Kiyavana Nuvana, Book VII, pp. 42-43; Heḷa Heḷiya, pp. 87-90.
 4. Gaṃgārohaṇa Varṇana Vivaraṇaya, pp. 6-7; Subasa, vol. II, no. 19 (1941), pp. 297-298.
 5. Prabandha Saṅgrahaya, p. 175.

not the proper sense of the word, but 'according to the morphological and syntactic rules of the literary usage'. His assertion also implies that the majority of the people of contemporary society do not speak a 'grammatical' language. This misconception was so closely linked with his attitude towards the development of Sinhalese that during the latter part of his life/^{that} it amounted to an extremism which should be called an 'obsession or madness'.¹ The inevitable result of his erroneous conception of 'grammar' is the confused and incompetent way in which the subject is presented in his works Kriyā Vivaranaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya, which are still revered by his followers as the 'apotheosis' of Sinhalese grammar.²

The most wrong-headed section of Kumaratunga's attitude towards language lies in his firm belief that the current spoken Sinhalese is 'corrupted' and

1. See Dinamina, 3 March 1944, Editorial.

2. See D. V. Richard De Silva, Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna, pp. 35-37.

'vulgarised' and that it has no grammar. But nowhere has he explicitly stated the reasons for his belief.

Kumaratunga viewed language as consisting of two extremes, i.e., correct and incorrect, or in his own words śiṣṭa 'civilized' and aśiṣṭa or grāmya 'uncivilized'.¹

This seems to be the weakest point of Kumaratunga's concept of language. His classification of language into gamvādi bhāṣāva 'vulgar language', kālā bhāṣāva 'forest language' and vyākaraṇa nāti bhāṣāva 'grammarless language'² is rather vague and illogical. On several occasions what he has called 'language', it seems, was rather speech. To him, the existing disparity between the written Sinhalese and the spoken is a 'debasement', 'degradation' and a sign of slavery.³ He positively declared that 'common speech in Sinhalese is to a great extent ungrammatical and therefore vulgar'.⁴ Kumaratunga's

1. Lak Mini Pahana, 30.4.1935, pp. 7-8; Prabandha Saṃgrahaya, pp. 165-166.

2. Ibid.

3. See M. Kumaratunga (sic), 'Queries Answered', The Helio, vol. I, nos. 11 and 12, 1941.

4. Lak Mini Pahana, 30.4.1935, p. 8.

career, as one of his followers observes was devoted to the task of clarifying what the 'civilized' (śista) language was and to the mission of propagating it.¹ As Bertil Malmberg observes: 'It is indeed a matter of some doubt whether the official literary form of a language does represent the spontaneous popular development. For earlier generations dialectal speech had even seemed to be a kind of degenerate language, spoiled by peasants who in their ignorance knew no better. This notion will even be found still today among people who have no linguistic training'² and Kumaratunga's pronouncements on the current spoken Sinhalese seems illusory and egocentric.

Kumaratunga's belief that the present spoken Sinhalese is 'incorrect' and 'debased' while the literary language alone is correct has persuaded him to create an artificial kind of Sinhalese by producing a blend of the two varieties. One example of this is

1. D. V. Richard De Silva, Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna, pp. 34-35.

2. Bertil Malmberg, New Trends in Linguistics, p. 54.

as follows. In literary Sinhalese sentences, the subject word is given in its nominative case form, and the finite verb agrees with the subject in number and person. Thus, the literary sentence mama yami 'I go' has the subject mama in the nominative case - the non-nominative form is mā - and the verb yami has the inflection -mi which denotes first person singularity. The colloquial equivalent of this sentence is mama yanawa. In colloquial Sinhalese, nouns do not make a distinction between nominative and non-nominative, and the inflection -nawa in the verb signifies present tense; number and person are not indicated inflectionally.¹ That the literary nominative form mama 'I' is identical with the colloquial word mama 'I' which has no non-nominative counterpart is coincidental. Kumaratunga, however, believed that a distinction in the 'correct' variety is a distinction that must be maintained in the entire language; and, that in this particular instance, if mama is nominative in literary, it should be nominative in the Sinhalese language as a whole. Kumaratunga has found that in

1. For details see pp. 36-37 above.

Colloquial mama yanawa, the nominative subject is accompanied by a verb which does not show agreement, and the lack of agreement where a nominative is involved is an error. One way of rectifying this would be to have mama yanawa replaced by mama yami in spoken Sinhalese: this the Sinhalese speakers' attitude to their / ^{language} would not allow, and Kumaratunga himself was sensitive to this. The ingenious solution he has come up with is that if nominative must not be used without agreeing verbs and if agreeing verbs are disallowed in spoken Sinhalese, then the use of nominative in speech must be abandoned, allowing non-nominative forms alone in that variety.¹ As has been mentioned above, the non-nominative equivalent of literary mama is mā. Consequently, Kumaratunga has decreed that the spoken Sinhalese sentence should be mā yanawa. Wherever the literary equivalent of a noun makes a distinction between nominative and non-nominative in its paradigm, Kumaratunga and also his devoted followers use the non-nominative forms in their

1. See Lak Mini Pahana, 14.8.1934. From this year Kumaratunga advocated its use.

speech, at least in public.¹

Much of Kumaratunga's articles and public speeches were devoted to the task of clarifying what he conceived as 'correct', 'civilized' and 'eloquent' speech. He published a series of lessons in his editions of Lak Mini Pahana which were especially designed to teach 'how to speak grammatically' and 'how to speak the 'good language'.² These lessons appear as a dialogue between a teacher and a girl-student of the fifth form. The following extract from his first lesson illustrates Kumaratunga's avowed aim: 'What some of these foreign educated scholars like is the workers' language; some like grammarless language; still others like the colloquial language. There are still others who desire the village-Vedda language. They say that there are two types of languages: the written and the spoken. The purpose of writing this Siṃhala Śikṣāva is to show that there is no such

1. See pp. 162-163 below.

2. Lak Mini Pahana, 7.5.1935, 14.5.1935, 21.5.1935, 28.5.1935.

difference'.¹ He has attempted to prove this by altering the normal speech forms according to the strictly literary usage. Consider the following:²

<u>wrong</u>		<u>correct</u>
<u>aragena</u>	'having taken'	- <u>āragena</u>
<u>etana</u>	'there'	- <u>etāna</u>
<u>etakota</u>	'then'	- <u>etekata</u>
<u>okkoma</u>	'all'	- <u>siyallama</u>
<u>kohomada</u>	'how'	- <u>kesēda</u>
<u>eccara</u>	'that much'	- <u>epamana</u>
<u>nēda</u>	'isn't it'	- <u>novēda</u>

The absurdity of his attempt is quite transparent. The forms in the second column never occur in the ordinary speech, and if they do, the conversation will sound quite artificial and pompous. He has also made absurd

1. Itin mebaṇḍu rata ugatun gen samahara denekuta vuva-
manā kulikāra bhāṣāvayi; samahara denekuta vuvamanā
vyakaranaya nāti bhāṣāvayi. Samahara denekuta kiyana
bhāṣāvayi. Samahara denekuta gam vādi bhāṣāvayi.
Kiyana bhāṣāvaya liyana bhāṣāvaya yi kiyā bhāṣā deka-
lu. Me 'Siṃhala Siksāvē' adahasa ebaṇḍu bhāṣā bhēda-
yak nāti bava hāṅgavimayi (Lak Miṇi Pahana, 7.5.1935).

2. Lak Miṇi Pahana, 7.5.1935.

attempts to correct even the normal pronunciation of words. Consider the following instructions given in the Lak Mini Pahana on the pronunciation of n:

'When we articulate n the tip of the tongue should touch the teeth. Otherwise it will be ṇ. Therefore, if n is articulated correctly, ṭ cannot be produced next. Instead ṭ is pronounced. Therefore minisunata 'to men' is correct. Because there is an a between n and ṭ, it is possible to draw the tip of the tongue after pronouncing n to the alveolar region to pronounce ṭ. Hence, stick to the usage minisunata'.¹ However, the usage minisunata does not exist in spoken Sinhalese at all; neither it is observable in written Sinhalese also. Its normal occurrence is minisunṭa. It is apparent that Kumaratunga ignored the fact that spoken Sinhalese has its own distinctive characteristics and differs from written Sinhalese with

1. 'n' kiyana viṭa diva datē gāvenna ōnā. Nātnam 'n'.
Eheyin 'n' hariyata kiyāvunot ilaṅgata 'ṭ' kiyavannata
bāhā. Kiyavennē 't'. Minisunata yanuyi hari. 'n'
yannaṭat 'ṭ' yannaṭat atarē 'a' yanna tibena nisā
'n' kiyana viṭa datē gāvunu diva 'ṭ' kiyannata mudunata
āda gannaṭa lābenavā. Ṭ nisā minisunata kiyanna
 (Lak Mini Pahana, 21.5.1935).

regard to phonology, morphology and syntax.

The above attempt of Kumaratunga clearly indicates that he has not grasped the most characteristic feature of human language, that it functions differently in different contexts and that 'correctness' or 'incorrectness' of use is never determined by any criterion except that of social acceptability. This evidence sufficiently illustrates the attitude of Kumaratunga towards language and his concept of grammar. According to his conception, grammar cannot be referred to as a study or theory that accounts for the way people actually use language. Quite contrary to the prevailing modern ideas of language,¹ for Kumaratunga people's use of language is something to be criticised and not described. These ideas are to a large extent reflected in his grammatical treatises and have been accepted by his followers as absolutely authoritative and idealistic.

It is evident that neither Kumaratunga nor any of his followers has supplied a clear enough definition of language or grammar. This is mainly because

1. See David Crystal, Linguistics, pp. 9-37.

their avowed aim was not to analyse or supply a comprehensive linguistic description of the language under consideration. The few grammatical treatises and the essays on some aspects of Sinhalese grammar which are scattered in the journals of the Hela Havula can be regarded as endeavours to legislate the linguistic ideal they upheld. As a result of their faith in the purity of the classical language, the grammatical works of this group are full of misconceptions and misinterpretations.¹ The idea that there are correct, pure and incorrect linguistic habits of a language is fostered to a great degree by pedagogical practices and it was the main purpose of Kumaratunga in compiling grammatical treatises (Kriyā Vivaraṇaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya) and the guide works on Sinhalese prose (Prabandha Saṁgrahaya and Prabandhopadeśaya) to teach how to use only the 'civilized language' (subasa) in all forms of writing. Consequently, his works, and their commentaries written by his devoted disciples appear as determined

1. See pp. 208-251 below.

efforts to forestall the decline of what they deemed the 'purity of the Sinhalese language'. Kumaratunga's aim, being himself a teacher, was to build up the younger generation, obviously the school front, in conformity with these objectives.

After the death of Kumaratunga, the Hela movement seems to have ceased further linguistic development but maintained its missionary fervour. The followers of Kumaratunga appear/^{to} have gone to the extreme of the dictates of their leader and have adopted the 'pure Sinhalese' exclusively, not only for writing but also for ordinary speech as well.¹ They constantly maintained and endeavoured to propagate the idea that it is only by adopting the 'pure language' that the Sinhalese race (räsa)² can be uplifted and dignified. However, even in the few grammatical works they composed

1. See Amunugoda Tilakaratna, Gatkaru Hamuva, where he says that Amarasiri Gunawadu and Alavuisi Sabihela can speak in this Hela medium quite efficiently and effortlessly. I have met a few members of this group, namely, Amarasiri Gunawadu, D. V. Richard De Silva and Vinnie Vitharana and also have had an opportunity to listen to their speeches, but the impression I gathered was that they could not continue in that Hela medium if the topic of discussion was changed to something other than language or literature.

2. This is the term that Hela Havula frequently use in

neither an introduction on the concept of language or grammar nor any reasons for their unbounded predilection for the obsolete grammatical usages of Sinhalese have been included, but only some near fanatic concern and sentiments for the protection of the national language. R. Tennakon, in his preface to Hōṇḍa Simhala, stresses: 'It is evident, when we examine history, that the rise and fall of our race corresponded with the rise and fall of our language'.¹ To him, evolution of language is a degeneration and corruption, and the grammarian's primary task is to

their writings to mean race, and was invented by Kumaratunga when he began to write exclusively in poetry-like language. However, this term has never been admitted to the majority usage, either written or spoken, and remains as one of the idiosyncratic usages of the Hela Havula.

1. Apē rāsē nāṅgīma bāsīma apē basē nāṅgīma bāsīma
anu va siduvī āti sāti yaṭa giya pavata salakā
bālīmēdī peni yanavā āti (Hōṇḍa Simhala, p. i).

Cf.

Basa duṁbul vuva vādikal nopavatī. Rāsēkā pana
basa yā yanu tatu dat viyat mataya yi 'If the
 language is weak, it will not last long. It is
 the considered opinion of the learned that the
 life of a nation is its language (D. V. Richard
 De Silva, Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna, p. 47).

forestall the language change and to devise a system of linguistic norms which is best suitable to represent the purer state of language.¹ As the name implies, his only grammatical work, Hoṇḍa Siṁhala 'Better Sinhalese', attempts to castigate the current Sinhalese usage as non-standard, non-Sinhalese and insipid and to foist upon it the morphological and syntactic features of the 13th - 14th century Sinhalese usage.² Because of these misconceptions and antagonism towards normal language behaviour, Tennakon's idea of language seems difficult to understand. In his concept of language, however, grammar is not a phenomenon which accounts for the actual usage of a given language.

Tennakon views grammar of a language thus:

'Just as man has a code of discipline, words also have a set of rules by which they are arranged in a given order. It is this set of rules we call grammar. Infringing these rules in composition is tantamount

1. See Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, pp. ii-iii.

2. See pp. 212-251 below.

to breach of discipline in human conduct'.¹ However, it is apparent that what Tennakōn describes as grammar is not the linguistic features found in the works of the vast majority of his contemporaries, but a resuscitated morphological and syntactic pattern that has gone into disuse. To highlight the dangers of violating the linguistic norms which they (Hela Havula) deemed as 'pure' and 'genuine', Tennakon goes far beyond the domain of language and equalises their linguistic ideal with civil law.²

Tennakon speaks of a colloquial variety of Sinhalese and employs some of its usages to clarify certain linguistic rules in his work Hoṇḍa Siṃhala. Conversely, he vehemently rejects the existing diglossic character in Sinhalese. This kind of mutually contradictory statements are frequently evident in his works.

1. Minisāṭa hikmīmata śikṣāvak āttāse mā vadan rāsataḍa pela gāṣī sādī siṭṭimata śikṣā āta. Ē śikṣā rāsata tamā apa viyarana naya yayi kiyanne. Rāsāyumehi viyarana naya siṇḍīma minis pevetehi nītiya kada kirimayi (Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, p. 16).

2. This is a very frequent feature in the works of the Hela Havula. It is evident that the adherents of the Hela school have interspersed several notable similes in their works not only to ridicule the modern ideas on language and grammar but also to lessen the apparent absurdity of their arguments.

For example, Tennakon rejects the normal utterances api yanavā, mama yanavā 'We are going, I am going' etc. as ungrammatical and non-Sinhalese: 'Some people use the subject of utterances like Api yanavā 'We are going', mama yanavā 'I am going' and mama hitanavā 'I am thinking' in nominative case. This is a mere defilement of our language by the people who, without knowing the actual Sinhalese usage, try to adhere to the foreign usages'.¹ This is not true. Tennakon's examples are normal utterances and are acceptable to the native speaker; therefore they are grammatical. When these utterances occur as sentences in written Sinhalese, the subject verb agreement rule takes place and ^{they} appear as api yamu, mama yami and mama hitami. What the Hela Havula wants to adopt as 'correct' and 'grammatical' in the ordinary speech

1. Ayek 'api yanavā', 'mama yanavā', 'mama hitanavā' ādi vasayen karṭṭu padaya uktavana sē prathama vibhakti-yen dakvati. E Siṃhalayā gē vyavahāraya no dannā videsi danan gē vyavahāraya anuva yamen siyabasa kelesimaki (Honda Siṃhala, pp. 255-256).

is neither of these two varieties, but a third variety of their own (invented by Kumaratunga).¹ The weaving of this kind of non-existing linguistic habits into a school grammar appears to be a serious obstacle to the proper understanding of the functions of language, though the Hela Havula still believes that it is the best way to emancipate the Sinhalese language. Their incessant rejection of the existing functional divergency between the written Sinhalese and the spoken is unaccountable.

Contrary to these ideas on the spoken Sinhalese and the written, which are interwoven with the grammatical dicta in the work Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, elsewhere Tennakon speaks of a spoken variety which characterises a spontaneous popular development. He asserts: 'Sinhalese unlike Pali or Sanskrit which were confined to literature only, was a language spoken by people. Therefore it has the characteristics not of a court language closed to the populace but of a large river which has

1. See pp. 150-152 above.

no hindrance to receive the streams coming from all directions; it has room to absorb linguistic elements from any language of any region'.¹ But though Tennakon stresses the fact that the Sinhalese language is different from Pali and Sanskrit due to its existence primarily as a spoken medium, he, in his only grammatical work, rejects the actual usage of the vast majority of his contemporaries as 'erroneous' and 'outlandish'.

Besides Tennakon, all the other disciples of Kumaratunga also have made constant effort to elucidate and exaggerate the basic ideas of their teacher, and the few works they have written may be referred to as concatenations of eulogies on their teacher and his doctrine of linguistic absolutism. At the same time continual resentful criticisms especially of the

1. Eluva Magadhaya hō Sakuva hō men potata ārunu basek novā minisun katā kala baseki. Eheyin ehi āttē Magadhaye t, Sakuve t men maha danā hata satara vāsala vāsū valavu sabāva novā ama digin galā ena aladola diyata vādimaṭa sarasak nāti maha nadiyeka sabāvayi. Kavara basekin vuvada kavara pasekin vuvada avut vadanā vadanakata Eluyehi ida kada ātteyī (Sidat Saṅgarāva, pp. xxiv-xxv).

language department of the University of Ceylon where the teaching of Sinhalese was begun on the modern linguistic guide lines, and of the works of contemporary, popular novelists like Martin Wickramasinghe have been interpolated in these works.¹ As the growing blind faith in Kumaratunga dogma was more virile and unshakable than any tendency towards dislodging the many shortcomings of the works he produced, the followers of the Hela doctrine have gone far beyond the horizons of their teacher in inveighing against every attempt that had been made to study the current Sinhalese language, more particularly the spoken. Their unbounded faith in the dictates of their leader has amounted to what may be referred to as lunacy and hatred towards the contemporary society. Consequently, their works, comparatively few, do not contain any significant ideas on language or grammar.²

-
1. For example, the introductions of the works Hela Pot Vimasuva and Engalanta Rajaya by D. V. Richard De Silva have been particularly utilized for this purpose.
 2. Martin Wickramasinghe asserts that the followers of Kumaratunga dogma do not possess any significant knowledge of Sinhalese language or literature. See Nava Padya Simhalaya, p. 14).

Amarasiri Gunawadu, in his work Maha Hela Vata, follows:

describes language as/ 'Language is the great ship by which we cross the ocean of dependence; it is the brush that paints the picture of the nation; the seed which grows the national spirit; the glass boat filled with gems of virtues; the bunch of flowers surrounded by the bees of respect; the unmistakable way to celestial comfort; the document by which the entire world is inherited; the earth which bears the ^{great} tree of the nation; the celestial tree which fulfils all desires; the great lotus filled with fragrance of virtue that blossomed in the great lake of the land; the great ocean that generates the gems of feeling; the strong door that blocks calamities; the only mantra that protects the nation'.¹ This paragraph has been written in

1. Basa nam gäti sayuru tarana tara näva; räsa ruva visi-
turu karana teli kura; räsa lädi danavana bijuvata;
guna miñi pirunu viduru oruva; buhuman biñguraḷa avala
mal pokura; saga sāpa sapayana atsana; mulu lova gäti
kala oppuva; räsa maha gaha darana derana; siyalu
manadola purana suratura; desa maha vil'hi pipunu
guna suvanda vihiduvana maha piyuma; hāṅgum ruvan upada-
vana maha sayura; vipat avurana tara dora; räsa raknā
ek matura yā (Maha Hela Vata, pp. 246-247).

imitation of the literary style of Gurulugomi, in Dharmapradīpikā,¹ and its underlying motivation is apparent - to illustrate the resemblance of their style and vocabulary to that of Gurulugomi whose works, particularly the Amāvatura, have served as the ideal of linguistic perfection for their puristic endeavours.² However, it is clear that Gunawadu's account does not convey any comprehensive idea of language as a instrument of communication nor does it try to give any impression of the nature and function of language or its intrinsic potentialities. When this description is placed/^{side by side}with that of a modern linguistic treatise,

it will be immediately understood how meaningless and frivolous the former is: 'A language is a set of principles establishing correlations between

1. Sil nam biyamuhudu tarana maha nāva, rū tavarana vanavātiya, kusalasānda dīnu kiri muhuda, kusala dham haṭṭaṇa bijuvala, guṇaruvaṇa pīru viduru dena, buhuman bīṅgumulu vatula kusum kana, hāma sapat kāṇḍavana atsana, marana nobana purisara, mululo das kala pat karana . . . (Dharmapradīpikāva, ed. Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama, pp. 126-127).

2. A similar paragraph written in identical style by Kumaratunga on the same subject is found in the Subasa, vol. 3 (1941), p. 2.

meanings and sound sequences. These principles underlie and make possible communication by means of overt verbal behaviour, but they cannot be equated with this behaviour. A language is a set of principles that a speaker masters; it is not anything a speaker does. The same kind of distinction can be made between a symphony and the performance of it. No matter how poorly it is performed, the symphony remains unaffected. It is an abstract musical system that underlies the activity of musicians but cannot be equated with their activity. In the same sense, a linguistic system underlies the verbal activity of its speakers. A language is an abstract set of psychological principles that constitute a person's competence as a speaker. These principles make available to him an unbounded class of sentences that he can draw upon in concrete situations. They are a crucial ingredient of linguistic creativity'.¹

For the adherents of the Hela Havula, language is not a social phenomenon which is used for a multiplicity of purposes but the codified linguistic habits

1. R. W. Langacker, Language and its Structure, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, inc., 1968, p. 35.

of a minority who consider themselves as final authority on all matters of language. On the basis of these assumptions the Hela Havula believes that the linguistic practice should comply with their puristic dictates rather than follow its natural course. These erroneous ideas are reiterated in the works of D. V. Richard De Silva who has emerged as the most vehement critic of the majority usage.¹

Richard De Silva is excessively antagonistic to the ideas that spoken language is primary and that writing is essentially a means of representing speech in visual medium. He firmly declares that the spoken Sinhalese is completely grammarless because it has not the morphological and syntactic pattern of the written Sinhalese: 'Those who ignore the grammatical rules (the exact rendering of his words viyarana maruvō is 'grammar killers') find a grammar in the actual speech. If grammar is the law of language, what grammar exists in the spoken variety?'.² He confidently

-
1. Richard De Silva joined this fraternity when it was under the leadership of R. Tennakon (1955).
 2. Viyarana maruvō kaṭa vaharē viyaranayak dakiti. Viyaranaya yanu basē nītiya nam kaṭa vaharē āttē kavara viyaranayak da? (Hela Pot Vimasuva, p. 19); see also pp. 20-21.

declares 'Is there a grammar in colloquial usage? The correct answer is that there is not'.¹ He claims that it was Munidasa Kumaratunga, in his own words guru devi 'teacher-god', who devised a grammar for the spoken Sinhalese; until then it had been without grammar: 'Munidas (Kumaratunga) introduced a grammar to the spoken language as well. He knew/that if it is necessary to honour the grammatical rules when speaking in English, it should be so when speaking in Sinhalese, too'.² The

-
1. Viyaranayak kaṭa vahaṛē ātīda? 'Nāti' yanu eyaṭa diyā yutu novāradi pilitura yi (Siya Bas Vata, p. 97); Compare also kaṭa vahaṛē īniyā viyaraṇa anuva pot liyāvunu dāṭa basāṭa siduvana vipata data hākiyi 'The day books are written in the so-called grammar of the colloquial language, the damage that will be done to the language will be clear (Siya Bas Vata, p. 97).
 2. Doḍana basāṭa da Munidashu viyaranaya bō kalaha. Īṅgirisīyen doḍana kala viyaranaya rākkā manā nam, Heḷuven doḍana kala da viyaranaya rākkā manā bava oḷu dutuvō yā (Kumaratūṅgu Munidasna, p. 36).

beliefs of this group that the spoken language is 'grammarless' and therefore 'vulgar' while the literary language alone is 'correct' have persuaded them to create an artificial kind of Sinhalese by producing a blend of the two varieties. It is this hybrid variety that is hailed as 'refined and grammatical spoken Sinhalese' by his followers.¹

The obsessive hostility of the followers of Hela doctrine towards the actual spoken Sinhalese of the day is reflected in almost all of their works.² While disregarding the language and style of the contemporary writers and reprobating the current spoken Sinhalese as 'nonsense', Richard De Silva endeavours to exalt the pioneering attempts of his teacher-god (guru-devi) in resurrecting the linguistic practices of the 12th and 13th centuries: 'If the grammar of the Kandy period and the Matara period or the journalese are not acceptable, what else except the grammar

1. For details, see pp. 150-154 above.

2. For example, D. V. Richard De Silva's work Emgalanta Rajaya 'British Government', though it is intended as a political science text, is replete with such ideas and criticisms on the Language Department of the University of Ceylon which he sees as the main foe to the advancement of their creed. See pp. 6-7; 9-12; 19-24.

of the Anuradhapura, Polonnaru and Daṁbadeṇi periods could be taken for the requirements of (present day) Sinhalese'.¹ These ideas are displayed with zealous spirit in every work of the disciples of Kumaratunga.

-
1. Mahanuvāra Mātara yugayē viyaranāyat puvāt pat viyaranāya t nogaṭa hāki nam Heḷa basē vuvamanavan saṇḍaha pihita seviyā yuttē Anurāpura, Polonnaru, Daṁbadeṇi pura viyaranāyen vinā vena kavara viyaranāyekin da? (Heḷa Pot Vimasuva, p. 25). Compare also the assertion made by Abiram Gamheva in an article read at the anniversary meeting to commemorate the death of their teacher: '12, 13 siyavashi Heḷa basa itā diyunu sātiyen pāvāti bavāt edavashi patapota pilibāṇḍa Kumāratungayan gē dānima kisivakuṭa nodevāni bavāt yana me dekarunehi lā kisivaku atara kisi vādayek nāti. Me vesesiyāvehi siti Kumāratungayō mekalāṭa sudusu basa sākasīmehi dī ē pārāṇi diyunu basē pāvāti bas daḥam yalit pavatvannāṭa da rakinnāṭa da nibaṇḍāyēn uvades dunha. Yalit ē pārāṇi vū diyunu vū basa mā padanam kara gena alut livisāriya gōḍa nagannāṭa sudusu maga salasāluha 'It is an indisputable fact that the language of the 12th and 13th centuries was at the pinnacle of development and that Kumaratunga's knowledge of the literature of that period is unsurpassed. Kumaratunga who possessed this distinctive achievement gave constant instructions in order to preserve the quality of that language and also to emulate the same. He outlined the way for a new literature based essentially on that ancient language of pristine glory' (published in Sitinamaluwe Sumanaratana, ed. Kumāratunga Munidāsa, p. 144).

As has been evident, the avowed aim of the Hela fraternity was the approximation to the language of the works of the 'Golden Age' of Sinhalese literature, especially to that of Amāvatura. However, it is quite obscure why they regard Amāvatura as the ultimate authority on Sinhalese language and literature. As John Lyons observes: 'The traditional grammarian tended to assume, not only that the written language was more fundamental than the spoken, but also that a particular form of the written language, namely the literary language, was inherently 'purer' and more 'correct' than all other forms of the language, written and spoken; and that it was his task, as a grammarian, to preserve this form of the language from corruption . . . It should be evident that there are no absolute standards of 'purity' and 'correctness' in language and that such terms can only be interpreted in relation to some standard selected in advance'.¹

As a grammarian, Kumaratunga's task was not to describe or analyze the way people actually speak or

1. John Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, pp. 42-43.

write their language, but to prescribe how they ought to speak and write. Although he is remembered today 'as a great pioneer and revolutionary (pili peralu) in the field of Sinhalese linguistics' (This is mainly by his devoted disciples),¹ the ideology he brought forward tempts us to regard him as an Alexandrian scholar who sought to restore the language of the classical texts and who thought that the classical language was inherently 'purer' and 'correct', or as a Latin grammarian of the period of Donatus (c. 400 A.D.) and Priscian (c. 500 A.D.) who attempted to perpetuate the classical tradition,² or as a member of the French Academy (Academie Francaise), founded by Richelieu in 1637, whose task was to describe 'pure' French and to defend it from all causes of corruption.³

-
1. D. V. Richard De Silva, Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna, pp. 22-25; Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Heḷa Vata, pp. 35-38.
 2. John Lyons, op. cit., pp. 13-14; R. H. Robins, A Short History of Linguistics, pp. 52-61.
 3. The absolutist government of Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin aspired to total control over every aspect of life, including language and literary expression. This was Richelieu's main purpose in founding the Academie Francaise. The Academy was entrusted with the task of 'fixing' the French language in a dictionary and a grammar. The dictionary came out in 1694 and the grammar appeared nearly three hundred years later (1932). For details, see Robert A. Hall, Jr., Introductory Linguistics, pp. 366-367.

Grammar, as described by the Hela Havula, is the art of writing correctly, and the grammarian's task is to describe 'good usage', that is the language of certain classical scholars, and to defend this 'good language' from corruption, such as the invasion of foreign words and grammatical features, and, more particularly, 'to prevent the good language from being corrupted at the hands of the ordinary people'.¹

The linguistic philosophy of the Hela Havula may be compared to what John Lyons calls 'the classical fallacy' in the study of language. He asserts: 'Since the language of the classical texts differed in many respects from the contemporary Greek of Alexandria, the practice grew up of publishing commentaries on the texts and the grammatical treatises elucidating the various difficulties that might trouble the reader of the earlier Greek poets. Admiration for the great literary works of the past encouraged the belief that the language in

1. Gam väsiyā gē kaṭa yana atata viyat basa yavannata
tāt kalahot agadi läbennē nikam mā gon baseki
 (Subasa, vol. I, no. 5 (July, 1939)).

which they were written was itself inherently 'purer', more 'correct', than the current colloquial speech of Alexandria and the other Hellenistic centres. The grammars produced by Hellenistic scholars came therefore to have a double purpose: they combined the aim of establishing the language of the classical authors with the desire to preserve Greek from corruption by the ignorant and unlettered. This approach to the study of language fostered by Alexandrian classicism involved two fatal misconceptions. The first concerns the relation between written and spoken language; the second has to do with the manner in which languages develop. They may both be referred to what I will call the 'classical fallacy' in the study of language'.¹

It was this kind of misconception that fostered the linguistic policy of Kumaratunga and has been maintained by his followers ever since his death in 1944. Even today, in a milieu where the study of language has developed tremendously, the adherents of the

1. John Lyons, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

Hela school still endeavour to safeguard the linguistic ideal upheld by Kumaratunga: 'He (Kumaratunga) had drunk deep in the fountain of Sinhalese classical literature, and was well aware of how the language had become a systematised, very flexible and expressive medium in the 12th to the 14th centuries. It was not improper that Kumaratunga hailed the language of that period as his standard'.¹

It becomes evident that the linguistic policies of the Hela Havula and its nationalistic and millennialistic objectives (which appear as the kernel of their linguistic philosophy) were fundamentally contradictory. The Hela Havula while attempting to instil and arouse nationalistic feeling and self-esteem among the masses rejects the contemporary language, language of the masses, as 'vulgar', 'debased' and 'ungrammatical'. The medium they chose (Hela) to appeal to the nation was not in conformity with its objectives, and, obviously, it could not meet the multifarious needs of the people who were in an era of growing democratization.

1. See Vinnie Vitharana, 'In search of a standard in Sinhalese', Ceylon Daily News, 19.11.1967, p. 4.

CHAPTER VI

GRAMMATICAL WORKS OF THE

HEĻA HAVULA

Before proceeding to analyse the grammatical works of the HeĻa Havula, it is an essential prerequisite to examine the nature of linguistic analysis and practice in vogue/during the late nineteenth century in Ceylon and the first quarter of the twentieth century, i.e., up to the emergence of the prescriptive and normative grammars of Munidasa Kumaratunga.

The earliest extant grammar of the Sinhalese language is called Sidat Saṅgarāva, compendium of grammatical rules,¹ written by the chief incumbent of the Patiraja Pirivena in the thirteenth century A.D.² It is not unreasonable to say that until very recently

1. See Sidat Saṅgarāva, ed. Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama, Kalaniya: Satya Samuocaya Press, 1902.

2. For a discussion on the authorship of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, see Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga Munidasa, Colombo: Anula Press, 1954 (second edition), pp. 5-11.

all the descriptive and prescriptive grammatical treatises (including those of Heḷa Havula) were, to a lesser or wider extent, based on the Sidat Saṅgarāva. Therefore, a preamble on the Sidat Saṅgarāva seems relevant here because the majority of the Sinhalese grammars written during the last hundred years appear as the products of misinterpreting of its purport.

The Sidat Saṅgarāva has been, and is, considered as the most authoritative work on Sinhalese grammar.¹ This appears to be a mistake. The Sidat Saṅgarāva has to be looked at not as a grammar of the Sinhalese language current at any time, but as a guide book or compendium of rules for the versifier, especially for the novice in this art of literary composition.

1. 'The reader must by now be convinced of the great place the Sidat Saṅgarāva occupies in Sinhalese literature, the great hold it has on Sinhalese imagination, and the high position it holds in the world as the great Grammar of the Sinhalese Language' (W. F. Gunawardhana, Siddhānta Parikṣanaya, pp. 11-12); Even Munidasa Kumaratunga, the vehement critic of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, asserts: 'However, the Sidat Saṅgarāva stands as the foremost grammar of Sinhalese' (Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya, p. 4).

The Sidat Saṅgarāva was intended as a set of rules for the transformation of words to suit metric requirements; but at the same time certain grammatical notions have been woven into this work. It should not, however, be deduced, as most of the Sinhalese grammarians have done, that this work is fundamentally a grammatical exposition. First and foremost, it is a treatise on versification. Therefore, its grammar is of secondary importance.¹ The function of the Sidat Saṅgarāva is distinctively different from what the early grammarians of this century tried to derive from it, and as a consequence, it has been analysed and criticized in the wrong perspective.

It is apparent that the Sidat Saṅgarāva is meant as a code of rules to make artificial and conscious changes in words to suit the requirements of the versifier. One cannot consider this work as a code of rules on euphonic matters in the normal

1. For a detailed discussion on the scope of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, see M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Some Observations on the Scope of the Sidat Saṅgarāva', in Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1965, pp. 67-88.

use of language. Therefore, the attitude taken by the author of the Sidat Saṅgarāva in describing word transformations has to be considered in relation to its function. In the study of normal Sinhalese language, whether written or spoken, most of the rules of the Sidat Saṅgarāva will be found unnecessary and erroneous.

One of the major characteristics of the Sinhalese language from the earliest times has been the marked disparity between the language of prose and verse in graphology, phonology as well as in grammar.¹ Until about the fifteenth century certain phonological features such as aspirates, some sibilants, the vowels ṛ and ṝ and certain syntactic devices were not allowed in Sinhalese poetry. It should be mentioned that in the pre-fifteenth century poetry, all lexical items which are of Sanskrit origin were given in their derived form only, i.e., loanwords were not permitted.

1. For details, see M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Some Linguistic Peculiarities of Sinhalese Poetry', in Linguistics 60 (1970), pp. 6-8; See also pp. 45-48 above.

It is evident that the versifiers have accepted the language of prose as the dominant form; the alterations of the prose forms were necessary to maintain the rhythm, rhyme and other metric properties required by the existing poetic theory.¹ The Sidat Saṅgarāva gives the rules for such alterations and transformations, and it stands as the first contrastive study of the language of Sinhalese prose and that of poetry.²

The Sinhalese word for grammar is viyaraṇa derived from the Sanskrit vyākaraṇa which has the same meaning. Both terms viyaraṇa and vyākaraṇa are in use in modern Sinhalese. The Sidat Saṅgarāva

-
1. It is evident from the works of Hela Havula, especially those of its founder, that they ignored the existing overt distinction between the language of prose and that of poetry, so much so that they have criticised a majority of the Sinhalese poetical works for violating some syntactic rules and word order, basing their views on the language of prose. See for instance, Sālahiṇi Sandēsa Vivaraṇaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaratunga, pp. 28-30; 63-66; 71-74; Mayūra Sandēsa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 157-159; 258-261.
 2. M. W. Sugathapala De Silva, 'Some Linguistic Peculiarities of Sinhalese Poetry' in Linguistics 60 (1970), pp. 8-9.

employs the term viyarana as a label for some twenty rules laid down at the beginning of the book.¹ The use of this term seems responsible for the misunderstanding of the purpose of the Sidat Saṅgarāva. Many critics, who were misled by the use of the term viyarana, accepted the Sidat Saṅgarāva as a grammar of the Sinhalese language and have interpreted the word duhunan (beginners) as 'beginners in Sinhalese language'. On this assumption they have severely criticised the Sidat Saṅgarāva for 'not helping the beginner even to learn the Sinhalese writing system'.

These misconceptions and misinterpretations of the purport of the Sidat Saṅgarāva have given rise to two schools of Sinhalese grammarians: those who thought that the Sidat Saṅgarāva is inadequate as a grammar of the Sinhalese; and those who regarded the Sidat Saṅgarāva as omniscient and the apotheosis of Sinhalese grammar. Munidasa Kumaratunga and his followers stand foremost in the anti-Sidat Saṅgarā

1. vī visi vādārum mehi 'viyarana' vidin sapayā (V.4).

school. They also realized that the attempt of the author of the Sidat Saṅgarāva was to fit Sinhalese grammar into the grammatical framework of Pali and Sanskrit.¹

Over a dozen Sinhalese grammars have been written during the last hundred years. The majority of these works have been framed under the misconception of the framework of the Sidat Saṅgarāva. The grammatical notions, definitions, examples and even the quotations embodied in the Sidat Saṅgarāva seem to have been utilized by these grammarians to the maximum extent possible. As a result, the grammatical categories which were not dealt with in the Sidat Sangarava have not been handled in these works.

Since the beginning of the new era of learning² there seems to have been a great demand for the standard Sinhalese grammars, both descriptive and prescriptive, mainly because of the widening diglossic

1. See Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga Munidasa, pp. 69-71; 99-103. For a different opinion, see C. E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature, p. 318.

2. See pp. 90-94 above.

situation between the spoken forms and the written forms of the language. There was a tendency among the Sinhalese Pundits, especially at the centres of oriental learning such as Paramadhammacetiya, Vidyalankara and Vidyodaya, to make widely known what they have accepted as 'more correct linguistic usages' (sē piyō). As a consequence, great emphasis was laid on the written Sinhalese as it was developed by Walivita Saranankara in the second half of the eighteenth century A.D.¹ Conversely, the spoken language far from being analyzed was completely neglected until A. M. Gunasekara wrote his A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language in 1891.²

Thus there were two serious problems before the scholars who were ready to venture on the writing of Sinhalese grammars: (1) What suitable grammatical model should be employed to reveal the inherent structure of the Sinhalese language, and how, and to what extent, the Sidat Saṅgarāva, being the only extant work of this nature, has to be taken into

1. See pp. 76-84 above.

2. See pp. 199-201 below.

consideration (2) Being in a somewhat linguistically heterogeneous situation regarding the normative and correct usages of Sinhalese, what sort of data should be analysed to elucidate the structural pattern of the Sinhalese language?

As we proceed it will be apparent how serious and how complicated the problem of selecting a proper code for analysis has been until as late as ^{the} 1960 s. It will also be seen that the attempts made by certain Sinhalese grammarians, more particularly by Munidasa Kumaratunga and his followers, were not in any manner to analyse the Sinhalese language (in this case only the written Sinhalese) of a particular period, but to weave the outmoded Sinhalese linguistic habits which they thought 'pure' and 'genuine' into a grammatical framework. Hence these grammatical treatises cannot be regarded as synchronic nor as diachronic in the modern sense of the term.

The Sinhalese language came to be analysed from a descriptive point of view as early as the first half of the eighteenth century by a Dutch scholar. It is noteworthy that at the beginning of the Dutch occupation in the coastal provinces of Ceylon, there seems

to have been a great interest in the Sinhalese literary activities.¹ As a part of the Dutch missionary activities and also as a part of their Bible translation programme, an attempt was made to compile a comprehensive handbook on Sinhalese grammar for the use of the Dutch scholars who were actively engaged in these activities.² The first Sinhalese grammar - in fact this seems to be the first attempt to look at the Sinhalese language from a descriptive point of view - composed in Dutch times is the Grammatica of Singaleesche taalkunst zynde een korte methode om de voornaamste Fondamenten van de Singaleesche spraak te leeren, published in 1708. This was written by Joannes Ruell, a Dutch scholar who seems to have engaged in the Bible translation activities. Being the first attempt on this subject, Ruell's grammar was later subjected to criticisms for its inadequacy as a guide book of the

1. P. B. Sannasgala, Sinhala Sāhitya Vamsaya, pp. 632-633.

2. James de Alwis (ed.), The Sidat Saṅgarāva, Introduction, pp. cclxii-cclxvii; S.G.Perera, 'Notes and Queries: Some ancient grammars and dictionaries of the Sinhalese language', Ceylon Literary Register, vol. Iv (January 1936), no. 7, pp. 327-329.

Sinhalese language.¹ The next Sinhalese grammatical work, which is said to be more explicit and descriptive, was also written in Dutch by Henricus Philipsz, a Dutch scholar.² It has been said that this work is noteworthy for its systematic treatment of the subject, and has served as a model for the later grammatical manuals.³

Since the beginning of the British rule in Ceylon (the first decade of the nineteenth century), the Sinhalese literary and linguistic activities were tremendously enhanced and encouraged.⁴ The Bible translation activities were started on a wider scale.⁵

1. James Chater, A Grammar of the Cingalese Language, Colombo: Government Press, 1815, see Introduction; See also James de Alwis, op. cit., p. cclxiii.

2. P. B. Sannasgala, op. cit., p. 633.

3. Ibid.

4. See A. M. Gunasekara, op. cit., Preface.

5. University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. III, (ed.) K. M. De Silva, Colombo: The Colombo Apothecaries Co. Ltd., 1973, pp. 346- 347.

As a result of British rule over Ceylon, there arose an immediate necessity to train a considerable number of government officials who would be competent enough to communicate in Sinhalese. Consequently, several Sinhalese grammars, especially designed for the use of European students, were produced.¹ Some of these grammars were prescribed for the Civil Service Examination in which several questions on Sinhalese grammar were compulsory.²

The first grammatical work by a British scholar was published in 1815, under the title of A Grammar of the Cingalese Language. This was written by James Chater, who seems to have taken commendable interest in Sinhalese linguistic studies. Chater, in his introduction, criticises the grammatical works of his predecessors for their inconsistencies and unscientific approach.³ Chater's grammar has been

1. University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. III, pp. 71-73.

2. See A. M. Gunasekara, op. cit., Introduction.

3. James Chater, A Grammar of the Cingalese Language, Colombo: Nicholas Bergman (Govt. Press), 1815, pp. iv-v.

praised by native Sinhalese scholars for its descriptive adequacy, accuracy and for the impartial scrutiny of the data.¹ It was Chater who first looked at the Sidat Saṅgarāva from a modern standpoint, and also who misinterpreted its purport to some extent. He appears to have realized that the Sidat Saṅgarāva is of very little help to study the spoken Sinhalese. However, from his observations two salient facts become evident. The first is the immediate necessity of analysing the spoken Sinhalese scientifically, which had until then remained unattempted. The second is the great difficulty of keeping apart the two distinct aspects of Sinhalese, i.e., spoken Sinhalese and the written, in a systematic linguistic description. It is significant that he has fully understood the existing linguistic diversity of Sinhalese. But although Chater has criticised the Sidat Saṅgarāva as an inadequate grammatical work on Sinhalese, it seems that his work has been modelled under a considerable influence of it.² Some of the

1. See James de Alwis, op. cit., pp. cclxix-cclxx.

2. Ibid, p. cclxx.

significant features observed by Chater such as the existing principles of grammatical gender in Sinhalese (three-gender system) and the disparity between the current written Sinhalese and that of the ancients and also between the written Sinhalese and the spoken, have been criticised by the native grammarians, perhaps due to their unbounded faith in the Sidat Saṅgarāva as the most authoritative grammar of the Sinhalese language.¹

After James Chater several other European scholars wrote manuals on Sinhalese grammar. They were Rev. Samuel Lambrick (1834), Rev. S. Coles (1881), Rev. C. Chounavel (1886) and John Block (1903).² Most of these authors were ecclesiastics and were actively engaged in educational programmes. It should be mentioned that these authors also have utilized the Sidat Saṅgarāva to a considerable extent and have misinterpreted some of its rules of word transformation. As

1. See James de Alwis, op. cit., pp. cclxvi-cclxviii.

2. For a full list of the Sinhalese grammars and the editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva written up to the emergence of the prescriptive works of Kumaratunga, see Appendix II.

we have seen above, the Sidat Saṅgarāva has gained such an eminent position as a normative grammar of Sinhalese that its influence on the study of Sinhalese grammar was inescapable.¹

The first Sinhalese grammatical expositions by native scholars came as elucidations and explanatory notes to their editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, the traditional grammar. It was James de Alwis who first undertook the task of bringing out the text of the Sidat Sangarava in a printed edition.² Being the first native scholar who directed his attention to the study of the traditional Sinhalese grammar and the literature, Alwis's conception of the Sidat Saṅgarāva as the most authoritative work on Sinhalese grammar appears to have been based on his belief in the purity and the priority of the classical Sinhalese literary language.³ Basing his arguments

1. See pp. 178-183 above.

2. James de Alwis, The Sidat Saṅgarāva, A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, translated into English, with notes and appendices, Colombo: William Skeen, Govt. Printer, 1852.

3. Cf. ' . . . to guard against errors to which a vulgar use of the Sinhalese leads Europeans, and also to the

on these assumptions, Alwis criticises the views expressed by James Chater, Lambrick and other European scholars regarding the diglossic nature of Sinhalese and the shortcomings of the Sidat Saṅgarāva as erroneous and misleading.¹

Soon after the publication of the edition of the Sidat Saṅgarāva by James De Alwis, several other editions (both by bhikkhus and lay-scholars) were brought out.² Pundit Tudawe Gunawardhana issued an edition of the Sidat Saṅgarāva in 1865. After Tudawe Gunawardhana, Pundit Batuwantudawe (1882), Ven. Hikkaduwe Sumangala (1884), Ven. Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama (1902), W. F. Gunawardhana (1924), Munidasa Kumaratunga (1934) and R. Tennakon (1954)³ brought out editions with commentaries and criticisms.

end that we may acquire a good classical style, it is of paramount importance that we study the Sidat Saṅgarāva' (James De Alwis, op. cit., p. cclxvii).

1. James De Alwis, op. cit., pp. cclxvii-cclxxvi.
2. For details see Appendix II.
3. The editions of Kumaratunga and Tennakon will be taken into consideration in the final section of this chapter.

Among these, the editions of Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala and W. F. Gunawardhana may be singled out (for our discussion) for two reasons: (1) These are the only editions in which the grammatical dicta embodied in the Sidat Saṅgarāva have been analysed on sound formal grounds. (2) In these works not only are elucidations of the Sidat Saṅgarāva included but also significant linguistic statements on Sinhalese (their own observations) have been made. The latter feature is more important for our discussion because, as it will be evident, the founder of the Hela Havula is generally credited with revealing (as he himself asserts) some of these statements, though they were originally expressed some fifty years before he actually began his literary activities.¹ It should also be mentioned that both Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala

1. See Muvadevdāvat Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga, pp. iv, 28, 93-94; Subhāsita Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga, pp. 59, 88; Piya Samara, see the introduction by Jayanta Weerasekara; see also D. V. Richard De Silva, Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna, pp. 34-37.

and W. F. Gunawardhana held that the Sidat Saṅgarāva is fundamentally a grammatical treatise on normal Sinhalese language behaviour.

In his edition of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala criticises the author's view that the two vowels a and ā are the result of lengthening of the syllable quantity of ä and ā.¹ He also, after demonstrating (convincingly) that the view of the author of the Sidat Saṅgarāva regarding the use of gender in Sinhalese is completely misleading and erroneous, has shown the necessity to stipulate a neuter gender for Sinhalese nouns.²

W. F. Gunawardhana has gone a step further and has shown that 'as a scientific manual, the book (Sidat Saṅgarāva) is really hopeless'.³ Unlike most

1. Sidat Saṅgarāva, ed. Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala, Colombo, 1884, p. 41; Cf. Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga, pp. 60-63.

2. Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala, op. cit., pp. 64-68; Cf. Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga, pp. 69-71.

3. W. F. Gunawardhana, Siddhānta Parīkṣanaya, p. 24.

of the other grammarians, W. F. Gunawardhana looks at the Sidat Saṅgarāva in the proper perspective for the most part and criticises and comments on the theoretical incongruities. His comments on the classification of gender in Sinhalese are of commendable value.¹ But in commenting on the definitions like saṇḍa (combinations), samas (compounds), agam (augmentation) and perāli (metathesis), he seems to take into account the normal language behaviour for which the Sidat Saṅgarāva was not intended. He disagrees with expressions like galapanu (arranging) which imply that the respective alterations are conscious efforts on the part of the user of the language.² He seems to have not realized that these changes are important and valid only in relation to the function of the Sidat Saṅgarāva.

The first Sinhalese scholar who undertook the task of compiling a comprehensive grammar of Sinhalese

1. W. F. Gunawardhana, op. cit., Introduction, pp. 26-28; 43-44.

2. Ibid., p. 42; 165.

was Weragama Puncibandara, a pupil of Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala. His work was published in 1888 under the title of Pada Nītiya (morphological study).¹ In his introduction, Puncibandara mentions that due to the incessant attempts of the Sinhalese pundits to teach the Sinhalese grammar by following the grammatical rules of Pali and Sanskrit, the Sinhalese language has been completely deprived of a systematic and detailed study.² He also mentions the great difficulty he has had to face regarding the data of his work.³

Pada Nītiya is a morphological study of Sinhalese and only just a few lines have been spent on the discussion of syntax. The author seems to have attempted to present his grammatical dicta as simply as he could, and as a consequence, a considerable number of colloquial forms have been woven into the corpus together with strictly written forms. This work is by no means

1. Weragama Puncibandara, Pada Nītiya, Colombo, 1888.

2. Ibid., Introduction, p. ii.

3. Ibid., p. i.

an analysis of the spoken Sinhalese nor an analysis of the written language of a given period, but appears as an admixture of the two distinct registers of Sinhalese. Two reasons can be deduced for not including a chapter on syntax in this work: (1) The Sidat Saṅgarāva, which has been the model of this work, does not handle the syntactic component of grammar in its scope, and, therefore, there was a lack of a normative guide that could be consulted (2) The apparent ignorance of the author regarding the syntactic rules of the written Sinhalese - the author himself violates some of the accepted syntactic rules of written Sinhalese.¹ It is obvious that what the author has conceived as the grammar of Sinhalese is not the structural pattern of the Sinhalese language, but the derivational and inflectional processes of word formation in Sinhalese. This has been the nature of the concept of grammar

1. For instance see, vibhakti pratyayō śabdavalā agin tun prakārayakata yedī pada siddhiya veyi (p.27). According to the accepted usage in written Sinhalese, pratyayō should be pratyayan in this context.

among the Sinhalese grammarians as late as the 1960's.

After Weragama Puncibandara, A. M. Gunasekara wrote his A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language (1891),¹ which appears to be the best among the descriptive grammars of Sinhalese so far written. This work is especially designed for the use of English readers (written in English and the examples are given in Sinhalese characters, occasionally transliterated). There is no doubt that he has made use of his knowledge of the European techniques of linguistic description. Gunasekara's definitions were made on sound formal grounds. He has made an exhaustive study of the Sinhalese morphology (He does not use the term 'morphology' but 'etymology', which was the better known word of the day). According to Wilhelm Geiger, Gunasekara's work is a rich mine of information: 'Finally, I mention, with grateful remembrance, the work^{of}/my late friend, the Vasala Mudaliyar A. M. Gunasekara, 'A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language'. It

1. A. M. Gunasekara, A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo: Govt. Printer, 1891.

was the first attempt to treat the subject in a systematic form and it still retains its value as an ample collection of linguistic material and a rich mine of information. It was also my first guide in my Sinhalese studies'.¹ The bulk of the book is devoted (345 pages out of 475 pages) to the study of the structure of words. Gunasekara's work may be divided into three sections: (1) graphology and phonology (2) morphology (in his terms etymology) and (3) syntax. The section on graphology has received much of his attention, and as a result the final section, which is the most important part of grammar, appears as a rudimentary analysis. The author does not make a distinction between the strictly literary and the strictly non-literary data, and he includes spoken forms together with literary forms wherever possible, perhaps to fulfil the 'comprehensive' part of the title. As a consequence, Gunasekara's grammar

1. Wilhelm Geiger, A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo: The Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch, 1938, p. xiv.

has turned out to be an unfortunate admixture of two distinct aspects of the Sinhalese language. However, Gunasekara's grammar should be praised for handling the structure of Sinhalese words in an adequate and scientific manner, and it stands out as the fullest word study of the Sinhalese language until the present day.

After A. M. Gunasekara's work, several other grammatical treatises were brought out. This was mainly due to the increasing demand from the native students and teachers for comprehensive grammatical works on Sinhalese. However, the Sinhalese grammars which came out as a direct response to the then growing demand were mere paraphrases or imitations of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, and they were primarily word studies. Vyakarana Mañjari by H. Jayakody (1900); Siṁhala Vākya Nītiya (1903) by John Block; Śabdānuśasanaya (1907) by Simon De Silva; Siṁhala Vyākaranaya by D. E. Johannes (1916) may be cited as examples.¹

1. See Appendix II.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that although the early Sinhalese grammarians have based their linguistic statements on the Sidat Saṅga-rāva, their works have been designed to analyse the Sinhalese language and were aimed at descriptive adequacy. But these works appear primarily as word studies and the sentence, as a primary unit of linguistic description, has not been dealt with. It is evident that grammar had been considered to be synonymous with morphology. It is also apparent that by the time of the introduction of the prescriptive grammatical works of the Hela Havula, some aspects of the Sinhalese grammar had been adequately studied - This has never been acknowledged by the Hela Havula. It is also significant that these early grammarians do not seem to have upheld any particular linguistic usage as 'pure' and 'genuine' or have attempted to introduce

obsolete linguistic features as normative. In their works the spoken Sinhalese has been included wherever possible, and it has not been regarded as grammatical. But soon after the launching of the puristic linguistic movement of Munidasa Kumaratunga, the concept of Sinhalese grammar became entangled with outdated standards and non-linguistic features like nationalistic ideas.

Section II

Kumaratunga's own linguistic dicta and expositions are embodied mainly in the Kriyā Vivaranaya (1935),¹ Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya (1937),² and also in the Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya (1934),³ and some detailed statements on grammatical notions and categories are found in his commentaries on Sinhalese classical works.⁴ Until the publication of his Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya (1937), he

1. This is the first grammatical work of Kumaratunga. As the name implies, it is a morphological study of the Sinhalese verb.
2. This seems to be the most ambitious work of Kumaratunga in which he has endeavoured to ascertain a logical basis for his concept of grammar and language and to legislate on what he thought was 'pure' and 'correct'. According to Kumaratunga, Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya was the result of over twenty-seven years' labour (Preface, p. cha).
3. This is an elucidation and critique of the Sidat Saṅgarāva in which Kumaratunga displays his commendable knowledge on Sinhalese classics and their grammatical structure.
4. Out of Kumaratunga's twenty eight editions of the Sinhalese classics, the following are noteworthy, and will be dealt with in our discussion for the reason that they contain some of his ideas on grammar and, in particular, his criticisms (and his alternative) on the then accepted grammatical notions and categories: Muvadevdā Vivaranaya (1922), Elu Attanagalu Vamsa Vivaranaya (1922), Amavaturu

had been preparing the ground for a prescriptive and authoritative grammar which would inevitably lay tremendous emphasis on/^{the}puristic notion of 'correctness'.

It is evident from the grammatical works of Kumaratunga that while using his puristic standpoint to analyse the Sinhalese grammatical structure, he has taken much care to avoid any of the intemperate attacks on the prevailing ideas of language and grammar and/^{the}dictatorial type of linguistic statements which are continuously found in his other works and journals. Kumaratunga's first detailed comments on grammatical notions and categories are included in the Sidat Saṅgarāva (1934), and also included in it are some valuable criticisms which were made on sound formal grounds. For example, his comments on verse 18 in chapter 3 of the Sidat Saṅgarāva may be cited. The author of the Sidat Saṅgarāva classifies the words ada (today) and e dā (that day) as indeclinables.¹

Vivaranaya (1923); Subhāsita Vivaranaya (1924); Sāla-līhiṇi Vivaranaya (1928); Parevi Sandēsa Vivaranaya (1932); Gaṅgarohana Varnana Vivaranaya (1933); Mayūra Sandēsa Vivaranaya (1935) and Lōkōpakāra Vivaranaya (1935).

1. Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga, p. 25, v. 18.

Kumaratunga argues, on the basis of formal evidence, that the words ada and e dā cannot be included in the category of indeclinables: 'In Sinhalese, ada 'today' is a noun. It is inflected as ada 'today', adin 'from' today'; adata 'until today' and so on. If e dā 'that day' is an indeclinable, kavara dā 'what date', giya dā 'the date of departure', ā dā 'the date of arrival', upan dā 'the date of birth', mala dā 'the date of death', etc. are also indeclinables'.¹ Kumaratunga's insistence upon formal evidence in setting up grammatical categories for Sinhalese is discernible in several places in his Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya. For example, he asserts that the sub-categorization of Sinhalese nouns into two classes anvartha 'real' and ārūḍha 'pseudo' is superfluous as such a classification has no bearing whatsoever on the grammatical structure.²

-
1. Siṃhalayehi 'ada' yānu nāmayeki. Ada, adin, adata yānādi visin ē varanāṅgeyi. 'E dā' yānu nipātayek vē nam, kavara dā, giya dā, ā dā, upan dā, mala dā yānādiya da nipāta veyi (Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, p. 190).
 2. Anvartha ārūḍha yāna dvibhēdaya Sidat Saṅgarāvehi dākvunu vyākaranayata nuvu māna yā. Anvartha vuyen hō ārūḍha vuyen hō varanāṅgimehi viśesayek vē nam, pada yedimehi viśesayek vē nam, mē bhēdaya ugata māna mā yā. E bandak nāti heyin mē nikam mā bareki 'The binary classification of nouns into anvartha and

Kumaratunga, at numerous points in his elucidation of the Sidat Saṅgarāva, demonstrates how the author of the traditional grammatical treatise was led to make incorrect linguistic statements about Sinhalese because the author's purpose had been to fit Sinhalese grammar into the grammatical frameworks of Sanskrit and Pali: 'In Sinhalese, the indeclinable men 'as, like' never occurs in combination with a noun in nominative case, but always with a noun in accusative case.¹ If the practice is to use the noun in accusative case, it is not a metathesis but the rule. In Sanskrit and Pali, the usage differs. . . . The setting up of grammatical rules on the basis of the usages in Sanskrit and Pali is like prescribing medicine for the daughter after

ārūḍha is unnecessary for the grammatical analysis contained in the Sidat Saṅgarāva. If either of these categories signifies a difference in inflection or distribution, this division, too, should have to be studied. But/since such a functional difference is not evident, this is merely useless(Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, p. 127).

1. Although Kumaratunga's criticisms of the statements of the author of the Sidat Saṅgarāva on the function of men 'as, like' are acceptable, his assertion that 'the indeclinable men occurs always with a noun in accusative case' seems incorrect. In Sinhalese, the

having diagnosed the illness of the son'.¹ Kumaratunga disparages the attempts of his predecessors to fit the Sinhalese grammar into the grammatical frameworks of Pali and Sanskrit and insists upon a type of grammatical analysis that would best suit Sinhalese : 'It is by examining the Sinhalese usage that a grammar for Sinhalese has to be written, not by scrutinising Sanskrit

indeclinables men, sē, vani and vagē 'as, like' do not occur in combination with a nominative noun, but they occur with/rest of the cases except vocative. This may be illustrated by the following examples:

Ohu ātaku men vāḍa karayi 'He works like an elephant' (accusative)

Lamayā dakunatin men vamatin liyayi 'The boy writes with his left hand as with his right hand' (instrumental)

Ayiyāgen men akkāgen mudal illā gānīma pahasu nāta 'It is not easy to borrow money from the sister like from the brother' (ablative)

Ballāṭa men būruvāṭa minisungen sālakilī nolābē 'The ass does not receive attention and care from people as the dog does' (dative)

Ammāge men akkāge koṇḍaya diga nāta 'The sister's hair is not long as the mother's' (genitive)

Muhudehi men gaṅgehi jalaya luṇu rasa novē 'The water/in river is not salty as sea-water' (locative).

See also R. Tennakon, Sidat Saṅgarāva, p. 87 where he says that in Sinhalese the indeclinables men, se, etc. occur exclusively with nouns in accusative case.

1. 'Men' nipāta yōgayehi prathamā vibhaktyanta padayak sambandha vīma Simhalayehi nolābennaki. Dvitiyānta

and Pali grammars'.¹

Kumaratunga's first grammatical treatise, *Kriya Vivaranaya* (1935),² does not contain an introduction, nor does it say anything about his treatment of the subject. This is quite unusual in comparison to almost all of his other works. 'In the study of grammar', says Kumaratunga, 'the category of verb is the most difficult to comprehend'.³ This belief of Kumaratunga may have led him to devote his first

(devana vibata gat) padaya sambandha vīma lābennē mā
yā. Itin dharmaya dvitīyānta padaya yedīma nam, ē
perāliyak no vē, rītiya yi. Saku Magadha dekhi rītiya
venas vē . . . Sanskrita Magadha prayōgayan balā
Sīmhala rītin niyama kirīma, putu gē leḍa balā duvata
behet niyama vani vihīluveki' (*Sīdat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya*,
pp. 101-102). See also *Muvadevdāvat Vivaranaya*, pp.
v-vi.

1. Sīmhalaṇṇa vyākaraṇa sāpayiya yuttē Sīmhala vyava-
hāraya vimasimeni, Sanskrita Magadha granthayan
perālīmen novē (*Sīdat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya*, p. 216).
2. This is a morphological study of the Sinhalese verb. But the author does not say what sort of data he has utilized in this work. However, by a perusal of the verbal forms listed in the lexicon, it can be stated that for the most part Kumaratunga utilized as his corpus the literary language of the pre-14th century works or invented forms.
3. Vyākaraṇayehi du ākhyātaya pamaṇa nodānennek nāti
(Kusaḷātaka Vivaranaya, p. 4).

grammatical work to the study of Sinhalese verb.

Kriyā Vivaranaya is regarded by the followers of Kumaratunga as the most authoritative guide to the understanding of the linguistic usage of the Anuradhapura, Polonnaru and Daṁbadeṇi periods (3rd century B.C. - 13th century A.D.).¹

Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya (1937), written two years after the publication of the Kriyā Vivaranaya, seems to be the most ambitious work of Kumaratunga. It was intended as a complete treatment of the subject and covers a wide scope of the Sinhalese language, including syntax which had hardly been dealt with by the previous grammarians. The preface to this work is significant as it contains several valuable statements he has made regarding 'grammar' and linguistic analysis which do not seem to have been based on his fanciful dogmas. For example, Kumaratunga affirms that actual usage should provide the corpus from which linguistic rules ought to be deduced: 'There may exist many other very great languages in the world. Their grammar may be absolutely pure. But in revealing the grammatical

1. Amarasiri Gunawadu, Introduction to Kriyā Vivaranaya, second edition, 1956, p. ix.

structure of the Sinhalese language, none of these should be taken into account. Grammar is linguistic usage. The grammar of each language is determined by the usage of that particular language. Therefore, the grammarian's task is to examine, collate, assess and epitomize the usage of the language for which he wishes to design a grammar'.¹ He also states that 'A grammatical work is nothing but the considered opinion of one who has carried out an exhaustive inquiry into every linguistic habit'.² Although Kumaratunga stresses the necessity of a systematic grammar for the Sinhalese language, it seems that he has not fully understood the function of grammar as is evidenced by

-
1. Lōkayehi itā usas anya bhāsā kotekut āti viya hāki yā, ehi vyākaranaya atinirmala viya hāki yā. Siṁhala bhāsāvē vyākaranaya heli kirīmēdi sālakiyā yutte ē ekekut no vē. Vyākaranaya nam bhāsā nītiya yi. Ek ek bhāsāvē vyākaranaya ē ē bhāsāvē vyavahārayen viniscaya karanu lābē. E heyin vyākaraṇa kāraya visin kala yutte tama vyākaranaya sapayana bhāsāvē vyavahāraya balā, alalā, perā, kirā, piṇḍu kotā dākvīma yi (Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. ga).
 2. Vyākaraṇa granthayek nam, sakala vākprayōgayan mānāvin vimāśūvaku gē viniscaya yi (Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. ga).

the following excerpt from his Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya:

'Nowadays some people seem to think that grammar is irrelevant. To him who suffers from indigestion, food is indeed a nuisance. For the primitive hunter, cloths are only things to laugh at. When one looks at things this way, it is not strange that there are some people who hate grammar. In civilized society, however, language needs grammar. If there is permission to violate the law, it will be to the joy of the criminal. If, for the happiness and comfort of the criminal, social laws were allowed to be violated, civilisation would begin to disappear straightaway. If there were permission to violate grammatical rules, the ignorant ones would certainly be happy . . . It would provide a way to conceal their ignorance'.¹ It is apparent that according to Kumaratunga, grammar cannot be considered as the statement of the structure of language, but a

1. Dān dān ātamaku vyākaraṇaya anavaśya koṭā sala kannasē penē. Ajirṇayen pelennāṭa āhāraya karadarayeki. Saba-rayāṭa vastraya sināvāṭa kāraṇayeki. E nayin balana kala, vyākaraṇaya nurusnavun āti vīma pudumayek no vē. Ehet śiṣṭa vū jana samājayē bhāṣāvāṭa vyākaraṇa atisayin avāśya yā. Samāja nīti kadannāṭa avasara āt nam, sāhasikayō satutīn ipileti. Ovun gē satuta hō pahasuva hō salakā samāja nīti kādīma varadak

set of rules devised by argument and postulation. As has been seen, Kumaratunga expresses some linguistically significant statements in the prefaces to his grammatical works, but these are hardly found applied in his grammatical descriptions. Therefore, Kumaratunga's ^{desire} proclaimed/to uphold some of the now accepted ideas of grammar seems quite futile when his puristic standpoint is exclusively being adhered to in his actual practice.

Apart from Kumaratunga's Kriyā Vivaranaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya, we have only two works of his followers that can be referred to as specifically grammatical works, i.e., Hoṇḍa Siṃhala (1962) by R. Tennakon¹

novana sē salakannata vuva hot, sista samājayē kelavara e tānin ārambē. Bhāsā nīti kadannata avasara āt nam, nodannō da satutūn ipileti. . . taman gē nodat kam dosa vasā gannā saṇḍahā yā (Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya, p. ka).

1. R. Tennakon, Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, Colombo: Sri Lanka Publishers, 1962. It seems rather difficult to refer to this work purely as a Sinhalese grammar; it is a hodge-podge about grammatical categories, essay-writing, letter writing, punctuation, stylistics, proverbs, rhetoric etc. As the name implies, 'Better Sinhalese', his aim seems to be to prescribe or regulate the Sinhalese usage (both written and spoken).

and Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma (1959) by Arisen Ahubudu and Liyanage Jinadas.¹ Even these two works cannot be seriously considered as grammatical works. Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, as its author says, is intended as a panacea for the impoverishment and degeneration of current written and spoken Sinhalese.² Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma is a prescriptive guide to the word-spacing in Sinhalese, a system which has been employed in all the works of Kumaratunga.³ Not only the rules for word-spacing are included in this work but also some grammatical notions have been interspersed. Our discussion on grammar therefore has to be based mainly on the works of Kumaratunga (Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya (1934), Kriyā Vivaraṇaya (1935) and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya

1. Arisen Ahubudu and Liyanage Jinadas, Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1959.

2. R. Tennakon, Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, Introduction, p. 1.

3. The author's purport is quite apparent: Siṁhalayehi pada beduma vidu huru vā kalō Kumaratuṅgu Munidashu yā. Ehet ē tava mā ātamunāta avuleki. E avula

(1937)) and those of Tennakon (Hoṇḍa Siṁhala) and Arisen Ahubudu and Liyanage Jinadas (Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma), since there is no other work of the Hela Havula which deals with the structure of the Sinhalese language.

One of the guiding principles of the Hela Havula in composing grammatical works was to reveal the genuine Sinhalese grammatical structure and to liberate themselves from bondage to Pali and Sanskrit. They firmly believed that other modern Sinhalese grammarians obscured the inherent structure of the Sinhalese language due to their inexplicable belief in foreign grammatical dicta,¹ and as a result of their attempt to fit the Sinhalese language to the grammatical frameworks of other languages. Therefore, the grammatical works of the Hela Havula, especially the works Kriyā Vivaranaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya,

lihannata apa gat tatehi pala ya me 'It was Kumaratungu Munidas who first systematized the word-spacing in Sinhalese. But for some people, it is still puzzling; our attempt is to make this easily intelligible' (Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma, Preface, i).

1. See Kumaratunga, ed. Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, pp. 165-166; Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya, pp. ga-gha.

have been intended as a corrective for this undesirable trend.

In his first grammatical work, Kriyā Vivaranaya, Kumaratunga employs the existing grammatical terminology to a considerable extent. Terms such as karma kāraka 'passive voice', kartr kāraka 'active voice', puruṣa 'person' ākhyāna 'verbs' and vibhakti 'cases' were directly borrowed from Pali and Sanskrit. But he has rejected several established terms and has invented his own instead.

Example:

prayukta (akhyātaya) instead of prayōjya
'causative'

svarthākhyataya instead of nirutsāhika

avasthika kriyā instead of asambhāvya
'conditional'

When he composed his most ambitious work Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya in 1937 he had almost completely invented his own grammatical terminology.

Example:

śabda saṁvidhānaya 'conjunctions' (sandhi)
miśraṇaya 'vowel combination' (svara sandhi)

ārohanaya 'vowel consonant combination'
(svara sandhi)

saṅkṣēpanaya 'vowel contraction' (svarādeśa)

samīkaraṇa 'assimilation' (pūrva rūpa and
para rūpa)

kṣayanaya 'elision' (lōpaya)

vardhanaya 'reduplication' (dvitva rūpa)

deśīya 'indigenous' (niṣpanna)

anupātita 'derivatives' (tadbhava)

ānita 'loans' (tatsama)

nāma yōgya karaṇaya 'cases' (vibhakti)

saṁgraha prakṛti 'compounds' (samāsa)

nāma pratyaya saṁgraha nāma 'derivative nouns'
(taddhita)

dhātu pratyaya saṁgraha nāma 'verbal nouns'
(kṛdanta)

nipāta kriyā 'present participles and past
participles' (miśra kriyā, pūrva kriyā)

Kumaratunga came to hold the view that the employment of traditional Pali and Sanskrit grammatical terminology would serve to obscure the intrinsic properties of Sinhalese linguistic structure.¹ However, it is apparent

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. gha-ca.

that the new terms he adopted for his work Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya are also Sanskrit loans which have never been included in any other previous grammatical work. Therefore, the inclusion of several newly coined terms to describe grammatical categories such as sandhi compounds, derivative nouns and verbs appears to have stood as an obstacle to the understanding of the expositions. Although Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is said to be an exhaustive inquiry into the Sinhalese language - this is mainly by the devoted followers of Kumaratunga -, its expositions remain unnoticed by the majority of students because of the use of unfamiliar terms to classify the various linguistic features of Sinhalese. It is interesting to note that the other two grammatical works of the Heḷa Havula, i.e., Hoṇḍa Siṃhala by Tennakon and Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma by Ahubudu and Jinadas, have not adopted the above grammatical terminology of Kumaratunga. These two grammarians have adhered to the traditional terminology. For example, instead of employing the newly coined terms such as saṃgraha nāma, nāma pratyaya saṃgraha nāma, dhātupratyaya saṃgraha nāma, ārohaṇa

found in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, these works contain the widely accepted terminology. Consider the following:

<u>pratyārtha nāma</u>	(Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, p. 17,20)
<u>taddhita</u>	(Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, p. 26,29)
<u>kṛdanta</u>	(Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, p. 31)
<u>svara sandhi</u>	(Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma, p. 83)
<u>pūrvārūpa</u>	(Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma, p.83)
<u>tatsama</u>	(Hoṇḍa Siṁhala, p.68)

It can be reasonably supposed that Kumaratunga wanted to set out his own way to provide for Sinhalese its own structural grammar unencumbered by the existing terminology or grammatical dicta which he regarded as highly misleading.

In his Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, Kumaratunga asserts that 'It is by scr^{ti}unising Sinhalese usage that a grammar for Sinhalese has to be supplied, not by scrutini-
sing Sanskrit and Pali grammars'.¹ However, it is evident that what he meant by the term 'Sinhalese usage' is not the written Sinhalese of the vast majority of his contemporaries, but the linguistic usages of the

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. ga.

12th - 14th century literary works which he resuscitated. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya has been designed to teach the rules of the 'good language'. Throughout the book Kumaratunga has employed strictly mixed Sinhalese (miśra Siṃhala) to explain the grammatical features. Although by the year 1937 Kumaratunga had gradually lessened his practice of writing in miśra Siṃhala 'mixed Sinhalese' and started to use more and more Heḷa forms, he has not employed it in his grammatical works. But the majority of the corpus that Kumaratunga utilized as a base in the Kriyā Vivaraṇaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya are Heḷa 'pure Sinhalese' usages. This is explained by the fact that in these works Kumaratunga has utilized as his corpus the language of the Sinhalese poetical works of the classical period and cited examples mainly from these works. For example, among the lexicon of nearly 800 Sinhalese verb stems contained at the end of the Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, not even a single verb stem which can be referred to as mixed Sinhalese could be discerned, though the language employed to describe these grammatical categories is of a mixed character. Even in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya only a few mixed Sinhalese usages

have been used.

Example:

<u>śiṣyayā</u> 'student'	(p.199)
<u>panditayā</u> 'pundit'	(p. 208)
<u>samarthayaku</u> 'a clever person'	(p.278)
<u>Brahmadatta</u>	(p.280)
<u>kumārikāvo</u> 'princesses'	(p.287)
<u>patraya</u> 'news paper'	(p. 289)

For his grammatical categories, almost all the examples were taken from the poetical works such as Kavsilumina, Muvadevdāva, Sasadāva, Sīdat Saṅgarāva, Kāvyaśekhara, Guttilaya, Sāla Lihini Sandēśaya, Mayura Sandēśaya and Tisara Sandēśaya etc.,¹ of which the language was considered by Kumaratunga as 'inherently pure' and 'genuine'.²

But in Hoṇḍa Siṁhala and Siṁhalaye Pada Beduma there are a number of mixed Sinhalese usages. It is also interesting to note that Tennakon has attempted to present his grammatical dicta as simply as possible,

1. For example, see Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 198, 199, 275, 276, 285, 287, 289, 291, 292-294, 302-308.

2. For details, see pp. 104-110 above.

sometimes by employing strictly colloquial expressions. This may be due to the fact that the Hoṇḍa Siṁhala was meant as a school grammar. Consider the following statements:

Ē vunat palamu vākyaya men sampūrṇa noveyi mē vākyaya (p.8)

Mē eka eken prakāśa kerena vādē kumakda? (p.26)

Nāmayak āyē kīma valakvā ē venuvata yodannata puluvan nāma sarva nāma namvē (p.112)

In this work an admixture of strictly literary and colloquial examples could be observed in several instances.

Example:

sulaṅga mūda ataṭa hamayi (p.5)

lamayā pāyata duvayi (p.6)

mal paravunāma bimata vāṭeyi (p.8)

anna lamayā āṇḍē (p.21)

mama enaturu iṇḍuva (p.25)

gāni hāl garā lipē tabayi (p.133)

However, to exemplify the grammatical categories such as cases, adjectives, compounds, verbs, syntactic agreement and indeclinables, the author has utilized the classical Sinhalese poetical works to a large

extent. As has been mentioned before,¹ this is not a full-fledged grammatical work in the real sense. For the most part it contains prescriptions on essay writing, letter writing, composition, idiom, style, punctuation and rhetoric.

Kumaratunga's Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya may be regarded as the first attempt by a native scholar² to treat the Sinhalese grammar systematically under phonology, morphology and syntax. Kumaratunga begins with the definition of language as a collection of sentences,³ and he seems to have taken the sentence as a primary unit of linguistic description. 'Grammar', says Kumaratunga, 'can be divided into three major parts, i.e., (i) graphemes (aksara) (ii) words and (iii) sentences'.⁴ What Kumaratunga means by the term

1. See p. 212, foot note 1.

2. Before Kumaratunga, a few foreign scholars such as James Chater and Rev. S. Lambrick wrote Sinhalese grammars. See Appendix II.

3. Bhasāvak nam vākya samudayeki (Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 2).

4. Vyākaraṇayehi pradāna kotas tuneki: (1) aksara, (2) pada (3) vākya (p.3).

aksara (graphemes) is the study of the alphabet and the basic sounds they represent. Out of the three grammatical works of the Hela Havula under consideration, only Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya deals with the Sinhalese phonology and graphology.

The chapter two of the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is a detailed discussion of the mixed Sinhalese alphabet and the Sinhalese phonology. Kumaratunga mentions that Sinhalese has an alphabet of fifty four symbols, i.e., eighteen vowels and thirty six consonants.¹ As most of the early Sinhalese grammarians have done, Kumaratunga also includes the vowels ī, īi and īi in the alphabet without considering the fact that they have never occurred in written Sinhalese. Even in Sanskrit the vowel īi does not occur at all. Although the language under analysis in this work is predominantly 'pure Sinhalese (Hela)', the description of the alphabet appears to have been meant to cover the mixed Sinhalese (miśra Siṃhala) also in sufficient

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 4.

detail. Much of the description is devoted to discussing the combination of vowels and consonants and the various shapes they take.¹ The analysis of Sinhalese phonology appears to be considerably indebted to the one provided by W. F. Gunawardhana in Siddhānta Parīkṣanaya (1924) (pp. 24-41). Kumaratunga's analysis is much more detailed than Gunawardhana's, but it also contains several grave inaccuracies regarding the phonetic properties of Sinhalese vowels and consonants. This is, undoubtedly, due to the lack of an adequate phonetic training. For instance, Kumaratunga makes such statements as

'all Sinhalese vowels are voiceless' (apa kiya-vana sātiyaṭa nam siyalu svara aghōsayi, p. 17)

'the nasals of Sinhalese are always voiceless' (vyākaraṇa pot'hi dakvennē ñ, ñ̃, ṇ, ṇ̃, m yana anunāsika śabdat ghōṣa lesayi. Ehet kiyāvennē nam aghōṣa lesa māyi, p. 18)

It is also quite strange to find in Kumaratunga's analysis that the vowels ī, īi and īī, which are not

1. Cf. A. M. Gunasekara, A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, pp. 3-21.

observable in Sinhalese at all, are assigned certain phonetic properties. He says in the above vowels,¹ there are more characteristics of a consonant, though the reasons for such a statement are not given.

The chapter on morphophonemics or junction features in Sinhalese (chapter 3) in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is much more detailed than the descriptions contained in the traditional grammar Sidat Saṅgarāva and the later works such as A. M. Gunasekara's A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language or W. F. Gunawardhana's Siddhānta Parīkṣaṇaya. In this analysis Kumaratunga employs his own terminology. However, the analyses contained in the Honda Simhala and Simhalayehi Pada Beduma are closely related to the one found in the Sidat Saṅgarāva. Instead of adopting the terminology invented by Kumaratunga, these authors have used the terms given in the Sidat Saṅgarāva. Kumaratunga's definition of morphophonemics

1. r, li dek'hi vyañjana svabhāvaya svara svabhāvayata vadā balavat yā (p.14).

is 'The arrangement of phonemes which are close to each other in order that there should be no gap between them'.¹ This (samvidhānaya kirīma) implies that the respective morphophonemic changes are conscious efforts on the part of the user of the language rather than the natural law. There are twelve such morphophonemic changes or rules in this description and each one is described as āti kirīma, nāti kirīma, ekak kirīma, māru kirīma etc. implying that all the rules mentioned are conscious efforts. Tennakon's definition of sandhi is that 'The combination of morphemes into one unit is sandhi'.² However, his analysis, which is very short when compared to that of Kumaratunga, shows close resemblance to the rules given in the Sidat Saṅgarāva.

In his analysis, it is evident, Kumaratunga has utilized for the most part the poetic language of the classical period. Most of the morphophonemic changes are presented by taking words which have undergone some modification due to metric requirements. It

1. Ek tan vū śabda atara ida nāti vana paridī samvidhānaya kirīma sandhi namī (p. 31).

2. Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, p. 278.

is apparent that the morphophonemic rules given in the Sidat Saṅgarāva are meant to make artificial and conscious changes in words to suit the requirements of the versifiers, and they are not rules on euphonic matters in the normal use of language. But Kumaratunga, without considering the fact that the sandhi rules found in the Sidat Saṅgarāva are valid only in relation to its particular function, has taken a considerable number of examples from it to illustrate his statements.

Example:

(1) vowel elision: ¹	<u>abarana</u>	<u>barana</u>
	<u>anat</u>	<u>nat</u>
	<u>asipata</u>	<u>sipata</u>
	<u>yuvarada</u>	<u>varada</u>

These examples have been taken from the classical Sinhalese poetical works. In normal written Sinhalese such a vowel elision does not take place. The word abarana 'ornaments' always occurs with its first vowel, so do the other examples. Although these words have occurred

1. Vyakarana Vivaranaya, p. 32. Cf. Sidat Sangarava, ed. R. Tennakon, pp. 73-74; 120-125.

in some classical poetical works,¹ they have never occurred in this form in any of the Sinhalese prose works. Therefore this morphophonemic rule cannot be considered as relevant to normal language behaviour.

Out of the twelve sandhi rules given in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, only four, i.e., miśraṇaya 'vowel contraction', samīkaraṇaya 'assimilation', abhyasana 'reduplication' and āgamaya 'augmentation' have been illustrated by the actual usages of the written language. Some examples to illustrate 'vowel augmentation', 'consonant elision', 'vowel shortening' have been invented by Kumaratunga. Consider the following:

- (1) mā + du > mayidu for vowel augmentation
ō + du > oyidu
ū + du > uyidu
ē + du > eyidu (p.43)
- (2) kiyadi - ki adi (kēdi) for consonant elision
siyana - si ana (sēna)
aduva - adu a (adō)
raṁgvā - raṁg ā (raṁṅgā) (pp.34,35)

1. ununova 'barāṇa' sivu sāṭa otunut pālāṇḍa (Sālaḷihini sandeśaya, v. 6); Ayirā dahas dili dunu kot 'sipat' gena (Sālaḷihini Sandeśaya, v. 41)

- (3) ō + du oyidu oyidu for vowel shortening
vi+ āta viyāta viyāta

In the majority of examples given, a sandhi is not observable at all. For instance, Kumaratunga gives the following words as the result of the vyañjana lōpa sandhi 'consonant elision sandhi': aṅga, īya, uru, ela, e, oru, pōya (p.34).¹ If these are taken as the result of a sandhi, then all such usages that had evolved during the course of time have to be treated in that manner. Kumaratunga, in defining sabda saṁvidhānaya (sandhi), says that the sandhi takes place when two words are joined together.² But in most of his cases, such environments are not observable. Kumaratunga's analysis, which seems quite similar to the one given in the Sidat Saṅgarāva, may be regarded as a set of injunctions for making artificial and conscious changes in words.

In the section on morphology Kumaratunga has again attempted to devise rules based mainly on the usages of the classical Sinhalese. Though he asserts

1. In all the cases above, an 'h' is elided.

2. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 31. See also Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya, p. 143.

that 'it is by scrutinising Sinhalese usage that a grammar for Sinhalese has to be supplied',¹ Kumaratunga utilizes as his data the language of the pre-fourteenth century literary works which he considered as 'pure' and 'genuine'. R. Tennakon and Ahubudu and Jinadas have inserted in their works some colloquial usages together with strictly literary forms, perhaps to show that they dealing with the contemporary language. However, in these two works, a systematic treatment of the subject is not given.

In the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, Kumaratunga deals with the noun morphology and the verb morphology in considerable detail. After discussing the different categories of morphemes in Sinhalese in chapter 4, Kumaratunga deals with the formal characteristics of the Sinhalese noun in chapters 6 and 7. Chapter 5 is an analysis of stems into (1) indigenous (dēśīya), derived (anupātita) and loans (ānita). In this section there is a list of foreign stems which are frequently used in modern Sinhalese, i.e., Tamil,

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 28.

Portuguese, Dutch and English.¹ This section is much indebted to that of A. M. Gunasekara in his A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language.² In chapter 8 Kumaratunga discusses the syntax of the noun. This section deals with the syntactic relations of the noun with verbs, indeclinables and with other nouns. Thus this chapter includes the analysis of subject + predicate sentence patterns, features of concord and agreement, and types of adverbial, adjectival and postpositional phrases. These three chapters (126 pages) comprise a full scale study of the morphology and syntax of the noun in Sinhalese. The section of verb morphology (chapters 9 and 10) and syntax of the verb (chapter 11)/^{is}taken from the Kriyā Vivaranaya. Chapter 12 is an account of indeclinables in Sinhalese. Chapters 13, 14 and 15 contains a detailed study of derivational processes in Sinhalese and the morphophonemic changes consequent upon the combination of roots with derivational affixes. The last three chapters are

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya, pp. 83-89.

2. See pp. 335-381.

on sentence structure in Sinhalese, which seem to have been influenced to a great extent by contemporary text books on English grammar.

Kumaratunga's classification of Sinhalese nouns into (1) bhinna nāma 'nouns which cannot be used for all'¹ (2) abhinna nāma 'pronouns' and their sub-classification into (i) jāti 'genus or class', (ii) dravya 'material nouns', (iii) guṇa 'quality nouns', (iv) bhāva 'abstract' and (v) saṃjñā 'proper nouns' are made purely on notional criteria. The same classification is followed by Tennakon and Ahubudu and Jinadas.²

The chapter on 'cases in Sinhalese' (nāma yogya karanaya) in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is presented in sufficient detail (63 pages). Contrary to the number of cases given in the other grammatical works on Sinhalese, Kumaratunga mentions only four cases with the animate nouns and six cases with the inanimate nouns. The following examples are given to illustrate this.

-
1. Siyallavun saṇḍahā yediya nohāki nāma bhinna nāmāyi: minis, diya, mahalu, Gāmunu (p. 90).
 2. See Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, pp. 114-115; Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, pp. 31-32.

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u> ¹	
(1) case 1	putā	-	puttu	(masculine)
case 2	putu	-	putun	
case 3	putuṭa	-	putunaṭa	
case 4	putā	-	putuni	
(2) case 1	dena	-	dennu	(feminine)
case 2	dena	-	denun	
case 3	denaṭa	-	denunaṭa	
case 4	dena	-	denuni	
(3) case 1	ata	-	at	(neuter)
case 2	ata	-	at	
case 3	at <u>in</u>	-	at <u>valin</u>	
case 4	ataṭa	-	at <u>valaṭa</u>	
case 5	atā	-	at <u>valā</u>	
case 6	ata	-	at	

It is evident that the possessive case and ablative case have not been included in Kumaratunga's analysis. Kumaratunga states that the morphemes -gē and -gen are not case suffixes but are post positions (upa kāraka nipāta) since they have meaning in isolation. This is not true. If the morphemes ata, un and in are considered as case suffixes, there is no linguistically valid

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 103-106.

reason to exclude the forms -ge and -gen from the above category.

In the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya and Hoṇḍa Siṃhala the following case suffixes are given:¹

		<u>sing.</u>		<u>plu.</u>
(1) <u>Masculine</u>	case 1:	<u>ē</u> , <u>ā</u>	-	<u>hu</u> , <u>ō</u> , <u>ó</u>
	case 2:	<u>ā</u> , <u>u</u>	-	<u>un</u> , <u>ana</u>
	case 3:	<u>ata</u> , <u>uta</u> <u>ta</u>	-	<u>anata</u> , <u>unata</u>
	case 4:	<u>a</u> , <u>uni</u>	-	<u>uni</u> , <u>neni</u> , <u>ni</u>
(2) <u>Feminine</u>	case 1:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>u</u> , <u>o</u> , <u>hu</u> , <u>ó</u>
	case 2:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>un</u> , <u>an</u>
	case 3:	<u>ata</u> , <u>ta</u>	-	<u>unata</u> , <u>anata</u>
	case 4:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>uni</u> , <u>ni</u>
(3) <u>Neuter</u>	case 1:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>ó</u> , <u>val</u>
	case 2:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>ó</u> , <u>val</u>
	case 3:	<u>in</u>	-	<u>in</u>
	case 4:	<u>ata</u>	-	<u>ata</u>
	case 5:	<u>ä</u>	-	<u>ä</u>
	case 6:	<u>a</u>	-	<u>ó</u> , <u>val</u> , <u>ni</u>

From the above mentioned case suffixes, several are not evident at all in connexion with modern literary Sinhalese. For example, the masculine suffixes e, ó and ana are found only in the ancient literary usage. Even

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 108-109; Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, pp. 197-198.

in ancient literary Sinhalese, the occurrence of the suffixes ē and āna is very rare.¹ In enumerating case suffixes for neuter nouns, these authors have largely ignored the current literary Sinhalese usage. For example, for locative case, only the suffix a is given. But this suffix is not observable at all in modern literary usage, save for the works of the Hela Havula. Instead, the suffixes a, ē, ehi are used with neuter nouns.

Example: gas + ē gase
 gas + ehi gasehi
 gas + val + a gasvala

But in Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, the occurrence of the locative case suffixes ē and ehi can be seen in a few places. Consider the following examples:

pittaniyē 'in the playground' (p.29)
 Golūmuhudehi 'in the sea Golū' (p.31)

of

In the analysis/pronouns, the prime attention has been paid to their traditional usage. Consider the following inflection of pronouns in Sinhalese:

		<u>sing.</u>	<u>plu.</u> ¹
<u>Mas.</u>	case 1:	hē -	ohu
	case 2:	ohu -	ovun, un
	case 3:	ohuṭa -	ovunaṭa, unaṭa
	case 4:	-	-
<u>Fem.</u>	case 1:	hō, ō -	ohu
	case 2:	aya -	ovun, un
	case 3:	ayaṭa -	ovunaṭa, unaṭa
	case 4:	-	-
<u>Neu.</u>	case 1:	hē, ē,- eya	ēvā
	case 2:	ē, eya-	ēvā
	case 3:	in, - eyin	ēvāyin
	case 4:	īṭa, - eyāṭa	ēvāṭa
	case 5:	ehi -	evāyehi
	case 6:	-	-

It is evident that the majority of pronouns given in the above paradigms are not found in current literary usage. In modern literary usage ohu 'he' is a singular pronoun whereas in this analysis it is considered as

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 151-152.

nominative plural and also accusative singular form. The masculine (singular) nominative pronoun hē 'he' which bears no resemblance to the other forms in the paradigm, is not used in modern literary Sinhalese. The widely accepted pronouns such as ovuhu 'they', movuhu 'these people', ā 'she', ohu 'he' (nominative singular), ēka 'that' and mēka 'this' have not been permitted in this description, mainly because they have not occurred in the classical Sinhalese literary works. However, in Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, the pronouns ovuhu and movuhu have been included, yet the current written Sinhalese usage of ohu 'he' as a nominative singular form is castigated as 'wrong'.¹ In this analysis of pronouns, some of Kumaratunga's own invented forms have been inserted. Consider the following examples:²

<u>anā</u>	- <u>annu</u> (to mean others)
<u>venā</u>	- <u>vennu</u> (to mean others)
<u>arē</u>	- <u>arahu</u> (to mean those)
<u>telē</u>	- <u>tulu</u> (to mean those)
<u>savuva</u>	(to mean everything)

1. See Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, pp. 39-40; Cf. 'Some people use the noun ovuhu for ohu. But it is not proper' (Ayek 'ohu' yanna yenuvaṭa 'ovuhu' yānu yodat. E hōṇḍa Siṃhalaya novē, Hōṇḍa Siṃhala, p. 16).

2. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 152-154.

The ignoring of the modern literary usage to a large extent and employing several invented forms to exemplify the characteristics of the Sinhalese noun distract considerably from the usefulness of the analysis of the category of noun in Sinhalese in these works.

Among the grammatical categories in Sinhalese, the verb has attracted much of Kumaratunga's attention, though it is described in rudimentary form in Hoṇḍa Siṁhala and Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma. Kumaratunga's Kriyā Vivaraṇaya is the first detailed study of the morphology of the Sinhalese verb, embracing not only all aspects of morphological form but also morphophonemic changes, certain aspects of syntax and the lexicon. In the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya these are summarized in chapters 9 and 10.

The preliminary definition of verb in Kriyā Vivaraṇaya is based on notional grounds.¹ But his classification and analysis of Sinhalese verbal roots

1. His definition of verb is 'That which conveys the notion of a root is defined as verb' (Dhātvarthayak denuyē kriyā namin mehi lā ganu lābē, Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, p. 1). Cf. Nodāv nuguna, dāv nisā sakarunen dā muva vā sidu kiriya nam 'That which is neither substance, nor quality, but in association with a substance, develops out of root, in six case relationships is verb' (Sidat Saṅgarāva, ed. Tennakon, p. 3).

appear to have been made on formal basis. In the first section,¹ Kumaratunga's classification of verbs into (1) finite verbs (akhyāta kriyā)² and (2) non-finite verbs (nipāta kriyā) is described, and the categories of number, person, tense and voice are set up. Their formal characteristics are described in detail. Kumaratunga classifies the verbal roots into six classes and gives their mutually exclusive sets of inflectional suffixes. Each conjugational class is then taken up in turn and is provided with a list of inflectional suffixes with which each root in the class may combine. The changes that take place upon the combination of roots with suffixes are stated, as far as possible, in the form of morphophonemic rules. Exceptional forms are set forth in a special sub-section called viśeṣa rūpa sādhanaya. One or more roots typical of each class are conjugated in full, and further examples of the members of each class are given at the end of each section. The derivation of nominal forms from

-
1. It is somewhat strange to find that the Kriyā Vivaranaya has not been divided into chapters or major sections.
 2. Akhyāta kriyā is Kumaratunga's own term. The widely accepted term for this is avasānakriyā.

verbal roots and the morphology of non-finite verbs are also discussed in sufficient detail. The last section of the book, Dhātu pāṭhaya, is a lexicon of nearly 800 Sinhalese verbal roots, alphabetically arranged.¹ Every root in the lexicon is assigned to one of the six conjugational classes and its lexical meaning is given. The morphological forms it may assume in the various grammatical categories are also stated in schematic form.

Kumaratunga does not specifically say what sort of data he has utilized in the Kriyā Vivaranaya. But it is evident that it contains for the most part the language of the classical Sinhalese poetical works. The setting up of six conjugational classes such as (1) balā- 'to see', (2) bamā- 'to revolve', (3) baṇa- 'to speak', (4) pihiṭā- 'to help', (5) rak- 'to protect' and (6) bas- 'to descend' has been based purely on classical Sinhalese usage. Out of the six verbal roots Kumaratunga has selected to represent his six conjugational classes, only four can be observed

1. This section covers more than half of the book (pp. 108-256).

in modern literary usage, i.e., balā-, pihitā-, rak- and bas-. The verbs derived from the roots bamā- and baṇa- are now obsolete and they never occur in modern literary Sinhalese, except in the works of the Hela Havula. The past tense finite verbs that are given to illustrate the combining of inflectional suffixes with the roots balā-, pihitā-, rak- and bas- are also not found in the current literary usage. The inflectional suffixes for the past tense verb have been set up by considering only the traditional Sinhalese literary usage. For example, the root rak- is inflected in the past tense as follows:¹

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
Third person :	<u>rakī</u>	-	<u>rāki</u>
Second person:	<u>rakihi</u>	-	<u>rākihi</u>
First person :	<u>rakimi</u>	-	<u>rākimu</u>

The verb rāki (plural) is not found even in ancient literary usage - it is an invented form of Kumaratunga.

1. Kriyā Vivaranaya, p. 11.

Consider the current literary usage:

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
Third person :	räkkēya	-	räkkōya
Second person:	räkkehi	-	räkkehu
First person :	räkkemi	-	räkkemu

It is evident that the past tense verb in current literary Sinhalese is formed by adding personal suffixes to the nominal form derived from the root involved.

The present tense singular inflectional suffix of the classes balā- and bamā-, i.e., a, is also Kumaratunga's own invention. The roots balā- and bamā- are inflected in the third person as follows:¹

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
Third person:	balā	-	balati
	bamā	-	bamati

The finite verbs of this type - balā, bamā - cannot be observed even in classical Sinhalese usage, except before da. This suffix is used in present literary

1. Kriyā Vivaranaya, p. 10.

usage to denote past participles. The inflectional suffix used with the above type of roots in the present tense, singular, third person, is yi. This may be illustrated by the following conjugations:

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
Third person :	bala+ <u>yi</u>	-	bala+ <u>ti</u>
Second person:	bala+ <u>hi</u>	-	bala+ <u>hu</u>
First person :	bala+ <u>mi</u>	-	bala+ <u>mu</u>

Kumaratunga has not given any reason for his treatment of a as the finite verb suffix (third person, singular) of the above class of roots. In Hoṇḍa Siṃhala and Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, which contain the same conjugations, the suffix yi occurs with the roots balā- and bamā-.¹

The majority of the examples given as the members of the six conjugational classes are not observable in present literary usage at all. They have been taken from the literary works of the 12th - 14th

1. See Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, p. 232; Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, p. 66.

centuries, especially from the poetical works. For example, the verbal roots upurā 'to extract', huyā 'to weave', rañda 'to paint', usaha 'to attempt', kana 'to dig' and viya 'to say'¹ have been taken from the classical poetical works. Some examples have been invented by Kumaratunga (invented forms are underlined).²

Example:		<u>present</u>		<u>past</u>	
	sing.	plu.		sing.	plu.
	pirē	- pireti	:	<u>pini</u>	- <u>punu</u>
	dirē	- direti	:	<u>dini</u>	- <u>dunu</u>
	musī	- musiti	:	<u>miti</u>	- <u>mutu</u>
	pasī	- pasiti	:	<u>paki</u>	- <u>paku</u>
	pāminē	- pamineti	:	<u>pati</u>	- <u>patu</u>
	hāpsē	- hapseti	:	<u>hāpini</u>	- <u>hāpunu</u>
	<u>udanā</u>	- <u>udanati</u>	:	<u>idani</u>	- <u>idanu</u>

The lexicon (pp. 107-256), which consists of more than 800 verb stems, is full of such invented verbal forms. Most of the examples to illustrate the occurrence of these finite and non-finite verbs are also cited from

1. Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 19-22.

2. Ibid., pp. 124, 126, 132.

the classical Sinhalese literary texts.¹

The account of indeclinables in Sinhalese given in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is largely based on the classical Sinhalese literary usage. Kumaratunga's definition of indeclinables is 'All words other than nouns and verbs are termed indeclinables'.² It is evident that this definition has been made on formal grounds. In Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, the same definition is given, but in Hoṇḍa Siṃhala a discussion on indeclinables has not been included. The majority of the indeclinables given in this analysis are not found in the present literary usage.³ Consider the following:

naraturu 'often', niti 'frequently', pili 'again' yali 'again', ekbiti 'after', pāsulu 'later'.

This section abounds with examples from the classical Sinhalese poetical works. Several indeclinables given

1. See Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 50, 59, 90, 101, 102, 104.

2. Nāma hō akhyāta hō novannavū siyalu pada nipātayi (p. 282).

3. Most of the examples were taken from Muvadevdāva, Sasadāva, Kavsilumina, Tisara Sandēśaya, Kāvyasekharaya, Guttilaya, Mayūra Sandēśaya and Sidat Saṅgarāva.

in this account are not frequent even in classical Sinhalese literary works. Consider the following examples: yora yora, ariyora, sakit, asakit, yav, yavat, tumutu, vissal, nihiya.¹ Therefore, this analysis could easily be referred to as an account of the indeclinables of the early Sinhalese poetic language. However, in the account (very short) of indeclinables given in the Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, the majority of indeclinables were taken from the current Sinhalese usage, and some are strictly colloquial.²

Example: lu, anna, onna, menna, vitara

But the archaic forms which are given in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya are also mentioned.³ Example: sahasā, tumutu, vissal.

The analysis of syntactic agreement in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya is a reflection of the traditional

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 287-298. Most of these examples were taken from the Sidat Saṅgarāva.

2. Siṃhalayehi Pada Beduma, pp. 14-16.

3. Ibid., p. 16.

Sinhalese literary usage.¹ The majority of the subject verb agreement rules given in this account are based on classical Sinhalese, and they are illustrated by examples taken mainly from works written before the fifteenth century. Out of the twenty-three syntactic agreement rules mentioned in this account, only six are applicable to the present Sinhalese literary usage. Consider the following rules given on the basis of classical Sinhalese poetic language:

- (1) The subject noun, though it is collective, which has been inflected with case suffix ē always takes a singular verb.²

Example: Mahadenē kelesun vānahī (Sidat Saṅgarāva)
 Bamara genē niriṇḍu pobayā
 (Mupobayāva)

It is evident that these two examples have been taken from Sinhalese classical works. Nouns such as denē and gene (with case suffix ē) are not observable at all in modern literary usage, and even in classical works such usages seem to be extremely rare.

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 274-281.

2. Ibid., p. 275.

- (2) Feminine subject, though it is singular, always occurs with a past tense plural verb. This happens only if the verb is a pure one (śuddhākhyātaya).¹

Example: Bāmiṇi liya put ruvana vādū
(Kāvyaśekhara)

This pronouncement appears to be a distortion of the classical Sinhalese usage. The finite verb vādū is not plural in this context. The verbal suffix ū (vādū) has not been used to denote plurality but as a distinctive feature to collate with a feminine subject.² It should be mentioned however that this type of verbs are now obsolete and can only be found in the works of the Hela Havula.

- (3) The verb with which a collective noun occurs is always used in plural number, except the nouns which occur with the case suffix ē.³

Example: Taman mana dola purati bingu rala
(Guttilaya)

-
1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 275. See also Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, p. 11.
 2. One of Kumaratunga's own followers disagrees with him on this. See Kodagoda Nanaloka, Amāvaturu nam Purisadammasarathi padavarṇanāva, pp. xxi-xxiii.
 3. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 274.

But if the action conveyed in the verb cannot be done individually, then the verb occurs in the singular.¹

Example: Muva rala deka va biṇḍina

This example appears to be one of Kumaratunga's own. In the first example the collective noun rala occurs with a plural verb, but in the second it is used as a singular noun. The reason given for such a division is purely notional. However, no real instance where the collective noun rala 'herd' has been used in classical Sinhalese as a singular noun is mentioned here. In modern literary Sinhalese collective nouns are normally used with plural verbs.

The grammatical works written by the Hela Havula were primarily intended to reveal the grammatical constructions and features which they deemed as 'pure' and 'eloquent' and which they wanted to adopt for the use of present-day linguistic needs. As has been seen, the Hela Havula believed that the language

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 274; See also Hoṇḍa Siṃhala, pp. 68-69.

employed in the classical Sinhalese literary works, especially the poetical works of the period between 12th - 14th centuries, was 'well-developed' and 'inherently purer'.¹ This firm belief has led Kumaratunga to take considerable pains to scrutinize and collate the language employed in these works to get his ideal of perfection. Kumaratunga even went so far as to invent his own examples on several occasions to exemplify some of the grammatical rules he devised on the basis of obsolete linguistic usages. His Kriyā Vivaranaya abounds with examples of this nature. The works Hoṇḍa Siṁhala and Siṁhalayehi Pada Beduma, though not grammatical works in the real sense of the word, contain for the most part enunciations and examples of the Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya and the Kriyā Vivaranaya. The occasional occurrence of examples from the contemporary colloquial usage is also evident in these two works, perhaps to fulfil the requirements as a school text. Although it is only in Kriyā Vivaranaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaranaya that a systematic treatment of the

1. See pp. 104-106 above.

subject has been adhered to and some grammatical definitions made on formal grounds, all these have contributed in so far as to enunciate the 'Helese' linguistic credo. The majority of the grammatical rules given in these works appear irrelevant when applied to the current literary Sinhalese usage.

Vol 2 of 2

Copyright on following page

PhD - 1976

A. K. Gunasena

Volume 2 of 2

To be returned to the
ACADEMIC REGISTRAR,
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
SENATE HOUSE, W.C.1
with the Examiners Report

PHD - 1976 - A.K. GUNASENA - Vol. 2



CHAPTER VII

THE HELA MOVEMENT AFTER KUMARATUNGA

Kumaratunga's linguistic reformatory movement, which seems to have been confined only to his own contentions until 1925, took a new and somewhat missionary fervour soon after he received support from Jayanta Wirasekara (1889-1949), a fellow teacher from his own locality. Wirasekara became the most prominent associate of Kumaratunga and was the chief whip of the Hela fraternity until Kumaratunga's death (1944) and then the leader of this group until his death (1949). Jayanta Wirasekara's embrace of Kumaratunga's puristic linguistic policy coincided with the publication of Kumaratunga's Subhāṣita Vivaraṇaya (1925): 'When Kumaratunga was anticipating comments and criticisms from scholars for his elucidation to the Subhāṣitaya, he had the opportunity of meeting Jayanta Wirasekara, who later became his most sincere and useful friend for his editing

of Sinhalese classics'.¹ Although there is no evidence to show that Wirasekara had been known as a literary critic or had any associations with Kumaratunga before 1925, he emerged as the most prominent supporter of the dogmatic pronouncements of Kumaratunga.

It is evident that Kumaratunga's puristic activities were enhanced and his editing of Sinhalese classics, to resuscitate the 'pure' Hela usage, was expedited after he started to carry on his campaign jointly with Wirasekara. The large number of classical works Kumaratunga edited with detailed elucidations and explanations of points of grammar, suggest that Wirasekara's contribution in this connexion had been significant. Kumaratunga himself acknowledged that the elucidations and criticisms contained in some of his editions of Sinhalese classical works had been written, for the most part, by Jayanta Wirasekara.²

1. Subhāsītayata kala vivaraṇaya gāna viyatun gē haṅgīma vimāsimē dī Kumaratungu Munidasun hata Wirusēkara viyatun purā hāndīnā gannata lābīni. Eyin ohu taman gē vivaraṇa katayutte mahat vāda āti sahakāra mituraku lat'ha (R. Tennakon, 'Munidas Maṅga', in Kumāratunga Munidāsa, ed. Sitināmaluve Sumanaratana, p. 82).

2. Apa gē adahas genā mehi bohō tñ liyā dena ladde

Wirasekara's activities in this fraternity may be divided into two categories: (1) writing long appreciations and detailed commentaries to the works of Kumaratunga, Tennakon and other members of the Hela Havula (2) attempting to propagate and elevate the puristic linguistic policy of Kumaratunga by organizing debates, meetings and also by criticising

the ideas of the non-purists. Wirasekara was not a gifted literary artist and has not brought out any work of his own. But his prime concern was to diffuse the 'Helese' doctrine of perfection and to hail Kumaratunga's teachings as incomparable. Soon after the inauguration of the organization Hela Havula (Pure Sinhalese Fraternity),¹ the necessity of creating branches all over the country was realized, and it was due primarily to the efforts of Wirasekara

Wirasekara mahatun visini 'The majority of these elucidations were written by Wirasekara on the basis of my views' (Kusajātaka Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga, p. 5); see also Sālaḷihini Sandēsa Vivaraṇaya, p. ii; Etān sita vivaraṇa pot degunayen ikman vi palaviṇi 'From this juncture, the editing of Sinhalese classical works/^{was} expedited twice as much' (R. Tennakon, op. cit., p. 82).

1. See pp. 130-131 above.

that the branch organizations in Matara, Kalutara, Gampaha, Kandy, Kegalle and Bandarawela were founded.¹

Jayanta Wīrasekara engaged mainly in composing commentaries and elucidatory notes to the works of the Hela Havula. He wrote a long introduction to Piya Samara and an elucidative commentary to it (1935); published the speeches and the articles which appeared in the journals on Kukavi Vādaya 'Controversy on poetasterity' in a book form (1938) and wrote commentaries with elucidatory notes to the poetical works Vavuluva (1939), Dā Vinaya (1940) and Hāvillā (1940) of R. Tennakon and to the poetical work of Warakagoda Silruvan, Lamā Viruva (1941).²

The long introduction to Piya Samara shows how Wirasekara has endeavoured to establish that most of Kumaratunga's pronouncements on Sinhalese grammar are incontrovertible, authoritative and are his own discoveries. For example, Wirasekara declares that 'It

1. See Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Hela Vata, pp. 81-82.

2. It is noteworthy that Wīrasekara's commentaries in these works are always accompanied with lengthy literary appreciations of Kumaratunga.

was Munidas who first discovered the fact that vowels can be categorized as elastic and non-elastic and that the environments in which the elastic vowels are replaced by non-elastic vowels are statable He also disclosed the fact that in Sinhalese there is no special verbal form for the future tense which can be formally identifiable'.¹ Although Wirasekara stresses that the above features in Sinhalese grammar came to light as a result of Kumaratunga's inquiry into the Sinhalese language, they had been discussed in sufficient detail by his predecessors, notably by Hikkaduwe Sri Sumangala and W. F. Gunawardhana.² Wirasekara considered it/his foremost duty to make Kumaratunga's teachings widely known and to place him well above all the other scholars in the world of Sinhalese scholarship. Kumaratunga's capabilities as scholar, orator,

1. Svarayan gē namyānamyatvaya hā namyayanāṭa anamyayan ādeśa vana tān hā palamuyen prakāśa kalahu da Muni-dāsayō mā yā. Siṃhala akhyātayan pilibānda vā Munidāsayan visin abhinavayen mā heli kala karunu mahat rāseki. Anāgatārtha prakāśaka viśēṣa akhyāta rūpayak Siṃhalayehi nāti bava . . . (Piya Samara, Introduction, pp. 40-42).

2. See pp. 194-196 above.

polemist and critic are vividly narrated by Wirasekara in his edition of the Kukavi Vādaya.¹

Rayipiyal Tennakon (1900-1964), the leader of the Hela Havula after Jayanta Wirasekara, was not a pupil of Kumaratunga, but he became the most active member and the poet in this group soon after he joined. Tennakon was encouraged and persuaded to engage in the onerous task of revealing and elevating the ancient tradition of Sinhalese poetry.² It is evident that during the lifetime of Kumaratunga, Tennakon was actuated to adhere to the composition of poetical works only. Consequently, he has written several poetical works, which cannot be understood even with the help

1. See Jayanta Wīrasekara, ed. Kukavi Vādaya, Colombo: Anura Press, 1938.

2. Kumaratuṅgu Munidashu pādi pabaṇḍa kirīmehi mā mā unandu karavā lūha 'Munidasa Kumaratunga encouraged me to adhere to the composition of poetical works' (R. Tennakon, Bas Pāra, p. iii).

of the accompanying commentary by Jayanta Wirasekara. His works Vavuluva (1939), Hāvilla (1940) and Dā Vinaya (1940) may be mentioned as examples.

Tennakōn started his career as a Sinhalese school teacher and he subsequently became the principal of a Sinhalese teachers' training college (Balapitiya). It is evident that he had known Munidasa Kumaratunga as a school inspector as early as 1918, but Kumaratunga's capabilities as a profound scholar, Tennakon says, he came to realize when he was a lecturer at Nittambuwa Sinhalese teachers' training college when Kumaratunga was the principal (1927-1929).¹ But there is no evidence to show that Tennakōn had a high regard for the doctrine Kumaratunga had been attempting to diffuse until as late as 1938. In his first literary work, the edition of Parevi Sandēśaya (1932), Tennakōn says: 'I came to know that Munidasa Kumaranatunga, a great scholar and eminent commentator, had already written a commentary even to this sandēśa poem. Unfortunately, this news reached me only after I had completed about

1. See R. Tennakon, 'Munidas Maṅga', in Kumāratunga Munidāsa, ed. Sitinamaluwe Sumanaratana, p. 72.

two thirds of this work, which, otherwise, I should not have attempted'.¹ After he became a close associate of Kumaratunga, he did not engage in editing Sinhalese classical works, but after the death of Kumaratunga his literary activities entered a new phase.

With the publication of Tennakōn's poetical work Apē Yata Giyāva (1938), he appears to have embraced Kumaratunga's linguistic credo,² and from this juncture until his death in 1964 Tennakon emerged as the most active writer in this fraternity and also a virulent critic of the anti-Hele ideas. Tennakōn's role in this group may be divided into two categories: (1) during the life time of Kumaratunga, he mainly engaged in composing poetical works, apparently to elevate the 'Helese' poetical tradition (2) After he

-
1. Prakata vivaraṇa katuvarayaku vana Munidāsa Kumārātunga mahatā me ma sandēsayata da vivaraṇayak kala bava asūmu. Abhāgyayakata dō ema puvata apata asannata lābunē mehi pitu asūvak mudrita vūvāta pasuvaya. Palamuven ē asannata lābini nam mē piṇisa gata vū kālāya apagē saṭahan kāryaya saṇḍahā ma yodāliya hāki vī (Parevi Sandēsayā, p. v).
 2. See R. Tennakon, 'Munidas Maṅga', in Kumārātunga Munidāsa, ed. Sitinamaluwe Sumanaratana, p. 92.

became the leader of the Hela Havula he changed over to prose compositions and to publishing his own editions of the Sinhalese classical works the majority of which had already been done with elucidations by Kumaratunga.¹ What he wrote after Kumaratunga's demise are mainly prose works, such as Kavuḍuva, Anura Pura Pirihīma, Gāmi Bāṇa, Giya Kala, Mulutana Andaraya, Ruppē Andaraya, Bas Pāra, Gamāyanaya and Mahamet Bavuna.

The poems composed by Tennakon under the direct influence of Kumaratunga are Vavuluva (1939), Hāvilla (1940) and Dā Vinaya (1940). These works were intended primarily to show how the Helese language should be employed in creative writings, i.e., especially in poetry, and also to ridicule the generally accepted ideas on the origin of Sinhalese and to criticize the Sinhalese society at large for being addicted to Westernization.

The Vavuluva, for which Tennakon was awarded the honorary title of kivisuru (The Greatest Poet)

1. These include Gira Sandesaya, Sālalihini Sandēśaya, Kāvyaśekhara, Budu Guna Alankāraya, Kovul Sandēśaya, Sīdat Saṅgarāva and Haṁsa Sandēśaya.

by the Hela Havula, is regarded by the members of this group as the pinnacle of Sinhalese poetry. In his long appreciation Kumaratunga affirms that 'If the Vavuluva was written in English or any other European language, it would certainly have won the Nobel price for literature this year'.¹ The peculiar title of this work is given to mean 'the language of the bat'. If Kumaratunga had not explained the meaning of this title in his introduction, the intended meaning of it would have remained totally obscured. 'What is this name, Vavuluva?' asks Kumaratunga in his appreciation. 'It is the language of the bat. If the Sinhalese peoples' language is called Sinhalese, why should not the language of the bat be Vavuluva? See how this poet's profound grammatical knowledge has helped in selecting a proper name for this work'.² However, the

-
1. Sāhitya pakṣayen ē ē avuruddehi usas mā sevāva loka-
yaṭa kalahuta devena 'Nobel' nam mahārga tyāgayek
vē. Idin imḡirisien hō ankisi usas Yaurōpiya bhāṣā-
vekin hō karinī nam ēkantayen mā mē avuruddē tyāgaya
'Vavulu' karuvānan soyāgenā ennē yā (Vavuluva, pp.
a59-60).
 2. Kimek da mē 'Vavuluva' nam? Vavulā gē basa Vavuluva
yi. Helaya (Simhalaya) gē basa Heluva nam, Vavulā gē
basa 'Vavuluva' vīma atisayin sudusu yā. Mē kavin gē
sūksama vū vyākaraṇa jñānaya kāvyaye an siyalu tanhi
dī men mā nam tibimēhi dī da pihita vū sāti penē da?
(Vavuluva, p. a4).

title itself of this book is an indication of its obscurity.

Vavuluva is presented as a dialogue between a female bat and a male crow, and is utilized to trace the history of the Sinhalese to an unknown past, even before the mythical king Ravana, and to criticise the ancient Sinhalese kings and their advisers, the Buddhist monks. According to the commentary on this work, the great 'Helese' civilization came to an end due to the treachery of Helese traitors. But although Vavuluva is said to be a satirical poem, its satire is not at all clear. Vavuluva may be referred to as the first attempt to apply the 'Helese' doctrine of perfection, enunciated by Kumaratunga, in a poetical work. This is evident from the first few verses of the book, and more significantly from the dedication. This work is dedicated to the letter ä - the unique feature and the soul of the Heḷa language, according to the Heḷa Havula.¹

As this is a work based on a dialogue between a crow and a female bat, the author has utilized

1. See Vavuluva, p. 73.

colloquial lexical items to a considerable extent, but they have been moulded in the preconceived obsolete grammatical framework that the Hela Havula endeavoured to elevate. Consequently, the normal spoken forms have been distorted to a large extent, and the Hela Havula grammatical specialities appear in these poems as excrescent embellishments which have been forcefully inserted. This may be illustrated by the following dialogue:

Soñdura nudurā godurak emi rāgena so yā
Iñduva etek netu putu hata pudā pi yā
Nobava tabā āta sita topa laṅgā mā ki yā
Erukā kavuduvaku davasekā venehi gi yā
 (v.2)

In this poem, the resuscitated ā is used wherever possible (nudurā, rāgenā, laṅgā mā, erukā). The sentence Erukā kavuduvaku davasekā venehi giyā is an idiosyncratic usage of the Hela Havula - it is neither observable in written Sinhalese nor in the spoken, and the usage venehi giyā 'went to the forest' is not found in current literary or spoken usage. Its usual occurrence is vanayaṭa giyā. The following of archaic grammatical features and the intermingling of current

spoken Sinhalese usages have inevitably resulted in making the Vavuluva/^{seem} a complete failure, and showing the inapplicability of the 'Helese' language and idiom to any kind of creative writing.¹ Vavuluva is accompanied with a detailed commentary of Jayanta Wirasekara (167 pages) and an appreciation of Kumaratunga (63 pages). But even with the help of these details, Vavuluva is not easily comprehensible.

Almost all the poetical works of Tennakon can be categorized as literary conundrums in which he sought to criticise the establishment of the Sinhalese society. His works Hävilla (1940) and Dä Vinaya (1940) were also written to achieve this end. Both of these poetical works contain Kumaratunga's appreciation and a commentary by Wirasekara. In the Hävilla Tennakon has utilized the colloquial lexis and idiom to the largest extent, primarily because the story is presented as it is told by a villager. But

1. See Gunadasa Amarasekara, Aliyā saha Andhayo, pp. 106-108 where he criticises the Hele Havula for their ignorance of the true nature of language and literature.

all these expressions have been moulded in the 12th - 13th century grammatical framework. As a result, the majority of expressions appear as highly artificial and contorted. Consider the following:

Me balā k̄ā gasana - madiva mā gevenavā misā

Mun gē kan asena - bavek nam nopene mā yā

(v. 16)

Suratalun bāṇḍā dī- maruvan haṭa ragenā mila

vaditi gehi mullata - gena yata haṇḍava haṇḍavā

(v. 20)

The concatenation of colloquial expressions with the pre-fifteenth century morphological and syntactic devices in Tennakon's works clearly testifies that he has a very fallacious idea about grammar and the linguistic habits of his own community.

It is evident that Tennakon has adhered strictly to a non-Sanskrit lexis from the very beginning of his literary career until his last work Hoṇḍa Sīmhalā,¹ the only grammatical work of Tennakon in which he has deviated from this. After Tennakon became the leader

1. See pp. 217-218 above.

of this group (1949), he seems to have preferred prose compositions and editing of Sinhalese classical works. He composed several lengthy prose works the majority of which have remained unnoticed by readers until the present day, apparently due to the obsolescence of the grammatical elaborations employed in them and the absence of any literary significance. The works Kavuduwa (1954), Gāmi Baṇa (1954), Apē Yata Giyāva (1955), Giya Kala (1955), Bas Pāra (1955) and Gamāyanaya (1958) may be mentioned as examples.

Tennakon's resumption of editing Sinhalese classical works was motivated simply by the fact that they had been prescribed for the public examinations such as G. C. E. Advanced Level, Teachers' Final Examination, etc. The majority of the works he edited had already been done with elucidations by Kumaratunga.¹ It is interesting to note that as it was not the policy of Kumaratunga to mention the previous scholars who had already edited the works he was engaged on, Tennakon, too, does not even refer to his leader's (Kumaratunga)

1. See foot note 1 on page 260.

works at all. Though Tennakon acknowledged Kumaratunga's incomparability in his mastery of Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese language and literature in the speeches he delivered, he has not referred to Kumaratunga's literary works or grammars in his serious writings. For example, in the Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya (1934) Kumaratunga supplies a detailed discussion on its authorship.¹ Although Tennakon's arguments in establishing the authorship of the Sidat Saṅgarāva seem to have received much light from those of Kumaratunga,² he does not even refer to it. It is quite anomalous to find that in Tennakon's editions of Sinhalese classical works and his grammatical work, the contributions of Kumaratunga are not mentioned, nor is even a mention of his expositions included, when in Kumaratunga's own pupils' works his elucidations and comments are being revered as unparalleled and unsurpassed.

1. See Munidasa Kumaratunga, Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 5-11.

2. Cf. R. Tennakon, ed. Sidat Saṅgarāva, pp. xi-xviii and Munidasa Kumaratunga, ed. Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 5-11.

In most of Tennakon's works, an anti-imperialist fervour can be discerned. He appears to have held the view that everything that came from the West was degenerate and the works by Western scholars on Sinhalese language and literature are worthless and unprofitable.¹ 'If my country and the people were not under a foreign power when I was born', says Tennakon, 'I would never have been a teacher but a devoted soldier to fight for my country, people and the language. It is a sheer shame to be a soldier to protect my country under a foreign king'.² For Tennakon, everything except the Sinhalese language and literature of the 12th - 14th centuries is unsuitable to be studied and emulated. He views English literature as worthless for Sinhalese people: 'Not only have I no ability to appreciate

1. See particularly his comments on W. Geiger's contributions to Sinhalese and Pali, in Vavuluva, Introduction, pp. 25-26; Bas Pāra, pp. iii-iv.

2. Mā upan avadiyē magē desat rāsāt anun gāti vā nopavattinnata, magē rāsehi rajaku hitinnata mā kisi vītekat guruvarayaku vannē nāti. Magē desa magē rāsa magē basa venuven āri situna sebalaku vīmāyi esē nam mā karannē. Para rajaku nisā magē desa raknata sebalaku hātiyata kāpavīma maṭa mahat pilikuleki (Vavuluva, preface to the second print, p. 24).

English poetry but also simply I do not have any interest in it'.¹ Although the intended meaning is not specifically conveyed, it can be conjectured that almost all the works of Tennakon have been designed to ridicule the establishment of the contemporary Sinhalese society of which he seems to have wished to remain as a self-appointed guardian.

After the death of Kumaratunga (1944), Tennakōn appears to have endeavoured to build up his own role as a nativist and purist rather than to uphold and reiterate that the teachings and the works of Kumaratunga are unprecedented and beyond compare. His last work Hoṇḍa Siṁhala (1962) clearly illustrates that Tennakon has not adhered to the terminology and methodology designed by Kumaratunga for his Kriyā Vivaraṇaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, and also he has relaxed his rigid policy of writing exclusively in 'Helese'.²

After the death of Tennakōn, the activities of the Hela Havula and propagating of Kumaratunga

1. Imgirisi kavhi rasa viṇḍimāṭa māṭa pilivan kamak vat asāvak vat nattēyi (Vavuluva, p. 25).

2. See pp. 217-218 above.

doctrine came under control of the ardent pupils of Kumaratunga most of whom belonged to his own locality. Amarasiri Gunawardhana (1912-), later known as Amarasiri Gunawadu, who succeeded Tennakon as the leader of this group (and has been the leader ever since) is a devoted disciple of Kumaratunga and also of Jayanta Wirasekara.¹ Being himself a Sinhalese school teacher and also from the same area as Kumaratunga, Gunawardhana devoted his time mostly in the Matara district to propagating the linguistic ideal of Kumaratunga. Among the few disciples of Kumaratunga it was Gunawardhana who first started to elevate and deify Kumaratunga's teachings and to refer to him as Guru-devi 'teacher-god' and Kumaratuṅgu Muni 'Kumaratunga the sage'.² His lengthy speech delivered on the fourth anniversary to commemorate Kumaratunga's death was devoted to exemplifying Kumaratunga's contributions to Sinhalese language and literature as incontrovertible and incomparable. In discussing a metre

1. See Amarasiri Gunawardhana, ed. Haṃsa Sandēśaya, Introduction.

2. Amarasiri Gunawadu, Maha Heḷa Vata, 1957.

in the Virit Väkiya Gunawardhana proclaims: 'This metre which has not been subjected even to the inquiries of the great Sanskrit Alaṃkārikas such as Mammata Bhatta, Dandin, Rajasekhara etc. has been revealed to Munidas. Not only were those factors which have not been discovered by the great Alaṃkārikas known to Munidas, but also significant points (concerning grammar) which have not been observed by the great scholar Panini have been brought to light by him'.¹

His book Maha Hele Vata 'The story of the great Helese leader) is specifically devoted to exalting Kumaratunga's doctrine and to emphasizing that the following of his teachings is the only way to fortify and dignify the Sinhalese race (rāsa) and the language (basa). Kumaratunga is presented in this work as a 'saviour' and always referred to as guru-devi 'teacher-god'. In several places of the Maha Hele Vata he is referred to as Kumaratuṅgu Muni 'Kumaratunga the sage'.²

1. See Amarasiri Gunawadu, 'Kumaratuṅgu Kiviyāvehi Des', in Kumāratunga Munidasa, ed. Sitinamaluve Sumanaratana, pp. 173-174.

2. See Maha Hele Vata, pp. 20, 24, 43, 90, 112, 140.

Gunawardhana has even gone to the extent of claiming that Kumaratunga's linguistic ideal is well known and is honoured in the Western part of the world, too.¹

Gunawardhana is not a literary artist. Apart from composing eulogies and delivering panegyric speeches on Kumaratunga's linguistic and literary contributions and on his charisma, Gunawardhana has edited a few Sinhalese classical works² and written a critique on the language of the Madol Dūwa, a novel by Martin Wickramasingha.³ As the activities of the Hela Havula seem to have rapidly fallen on the path of decline and, more particularly, have become confined to the Matara district after the death of Tennakon, the only leading member of this group who did not belong to Matara clan, it appears that Gunawardhana could not sustain the Hela movement in its vigour and membership as it was some years earlier

1. See Subasa, vol. 8, pt. 2 (October, 1965), pp. 291-301; See also Maha Hela Vata, pp. 410-411.

2. These works include Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya (1952), Ham̐sa Sandēśaya (1953), Pārakumba Sirit Peheliya (1953) and Pūjavalīya (chapters 13-19) (1961).

3. Madolduvē Hāti (1953).

By the year 1965, this group consisted of less than twenty-five members all of whom were eccentric devotees of Kumaratunga dogma. According to a speech delivered by Amarasiri Gunawadu on 9 July 1966, to celebrate the silver jubilee of the Hela Havula, the following names are given as the active members of this group: Arisen Ahubudu, Warakagoda Silruvan, Vinnie Vitharana, Kodagoda Nanaloka, Alavuisi Sabihela, Gunapala Abiram Gamheva, Senadhira, Gamhewa Gunawardhana, /A. D. Chandrasekara, Dharma Sri Kumaratunga, Jayamaha Wellala, Hiyubat Dissanayaka, Charles De Silva, Mahanama Dissanayaka, Mohotti Donu Davidu, D. V. Richard De Silva, K. B. Jayasuriya, Jayasekara Abeyruvan and Father Moses Perera.¹ It is interesting to note that only two Buddhist monks have ^{active} taken/part in this group, i.e., Varakagoda Silruvan² and Kodagoda Ñāṇāloka. This is mainly because Kumaratunga's and his ardent followers' unorthodox ideas of Buddhism and virulent criticisms of the entire Buddhist hierarchy had evoked their resentment.

1. See Subasa, vol. 8, no. 2 (July 1966), pp. 318-319.

2. This is the Hela form of the name Sīlaratana.

Out of the above mentioned members of this group Amarasiri Gunawadu (leader), Arisen Ahubudu, Alavuisi Sabihela, D. V. Richard De Silva, Vinnie Vitharana, Gamhewa Gunawardhana, Abiram Gamhewa, Kodagoda Nanaloka and Hiyubat Dissanayaka became prominent and active upholders of the linguistic precepts of Kumaratunga. These followers of Kumaratunga seem to have gone to the extreme of the dictates of their teacher, and with them the Hela movement appears to have ceased further linguistic reformation and turned into a mission with a grievance with the addition of a certain bitterness. They started to criticise the activities of the Language Department of the University of Ceylon, especially for promoting the idea that spoken language has its own grammar.¹

To be in perfect harmony to the Guru-devi's policies, some members of this group changed their names at subsequent stages. After Kumaratunga started

1. For instance, see D. V. Richard De Silva, Hela Pot Vimasuva, pp. 9-10 where he says that the dons of the University do not know the Hela language well enough to write a good essay in it, but pose as the highest scholars.

to write exclusively in Hela language, his devoted disciples state that he finally changed his name to Kumaratungu Munidas to tally with his new insight into the Sinhalese language. Although Kumaratunga's name appears in his works which have been reprinted after his death as 'Kumaratungu Munidas', there is no evidence to confirm that he actually made such a change.¹ However, some of Kumaratunga's ardent pupils have gone far beyond the extremes of their teacher and have changed and transformed their names to be in harmony with the hyper Helese view they upheld - all the foreign elements in their names have been replaced by the

Helese equivalents:

Example:	(Amarasiri) Gunawardhana	Gunawadu
	Ariyasēna Asubodha	Arisen Ahubudu
	Sāviyel Alwis	Alavuisi Sabihela
	Don David Mohotti	Mohotti Donu
		Davidu

Certain members of this group started to replace the English initials of their names by straight-forward

1. According to R. Tennakon, Kumaratunga did not make such a change, see Amunugoda Tilakaratna, Gatkaru Hamuva, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1964, p. 73.

Sinhalese initials:¹

D. V. Richard De Silva	-	Di. Vi. Richard De Silva
A. D. Chandrasekara	-	A. Do. Chandrasekara
K. B. Jayasuriya	-	Ku. Be. Jayasuriya

However, this transformation has not been adhered to by the rest of the members of this group at all.²

Arisen Ahubudu, D. V. Richard De Silva, Alavuisi Sabihela, Hiyubat Disanayaka and Abiram Gamheva have gone to the extreme of the dictates of their teacher and have upheld the view that 'pure Sinhalese' should be employed exclusively not only for writing but also for mass communication. While continuing to uphold the linguistic policy of Kumaratunga 'to win the Helese over', these few

1. It is interesting to see how D. V. Richard De Silva has altered his name to tally with the 'pure Sinhalese' tradition - only initials have been replaced by Sinhalese equivalents whereas 'Richard' (English) and 'De Silva' (Portuguese) have been retained.
2. Cf. Vinnie Vitharana, Kodagoda Nanaloka, Gamheva Gunawardhana, Mahanama Disanayaka, Dharma Sri Kumaranatunga etc.

members began to let off fusillades of criticisms at popular novelists like Martin Wickramasingha and the writers of the University of Ceylon, and for the most part they only composed eulogies and exegetical details to the works of their leader. Arisen Ahubudu's Kumartuṅgu Āsura (1957), Ahubudu, Amarasiri Gunawadu and Vinnie Vitharana's Kumartuṅgu Pādi Ekatuva (1970), D. V. Richard De Silva's Kumartuṅgu Munidasna (1969), Abiram Gamhewa's Hadāruva (1968) may be mentioned as the outcome of this endeavour. However, only Hiyubat Dissanayaka, who embraced the Helese doctrine when the Hela movement was under the leadership of Tennakon, has ventured to continue to elevate the Helese poetical tradition by producing his own works. Unlike Tennakon, Dissanayaka has not considered foreign literary works as worthless for Sinhalese people and has translated a few works into Sinhalese.¹ He also wrote several short stories especially for children. For example, Nari Hināva has been written in imitation of the language and style of Kumartunga's work Hin Sāraya, which was also intended as a school text.

The followers of Kumartunga constantly maintained and endeavoured to propagate the idea that it is only

1. These include Balal Billa (translation of G. A. Henty's The Cat of Bubastes), Hiroṣimāve Mal (translation of Morris Edita's The Flowers of Hiroshima) and Otōmiya (translation of Rider Haggard's Montezuma's daughter).

by adopting the 'Hela' language that the Sinhalese race can be civilized and dignified. D. V. Richard De Silva has even gone further to assert that not only books on Sinhalese language and literature should be written exclusively in Hela but also texts on Political Science, Geography, Biology, Sociology and Medicine should be written in the Hela language.¹

De Silva published a book on 'Political Science', entitled Emgalanta Rajaya 'The British Government' (1959) in which he has displayed his desire to uphold some of Kumaratunga's extremist views on Sinhalese language and people. In this work he has ventured to design a Hela terminology for Political Science in which he has rejected all the terms which had already been recognized and established in this discipline. De Silva declares: 'From a foreign language we get its peoples' cultural components. When there are considerable numbers of foreign words in the Sinhalese language, the people who speak it inevitably lose their dignity and independence.'

1. See Di. Vi. Richard De Silva, Emgalanta Rajaya, Introduction. De Silva is a graduate of the University of Ceylon.

Then what critical power, what creativity, what dignity, what independent thought can exist?'¹ He further asserts: 'To forestall the mean idea that writers should borrow from other languages such as Sanskrit, English etc. to expand and develop the Sinhalese lexicon, we must endeavour to use only the Hela language and to invent new words solely on the basis of Helese doctrine'.²

As an initial step De Silva published his book Emgalanta Rajaya to illustrate that any concept or any serious discipline can be expressed using only the Hela forms and idiom, but he has never stopped to see the incomprehensibility and absurdity that this extreme form of Hela can cause when it is applied to such a subject. Consider the following quotation:

Patuvaku lesa idiripāt vannā ohu gē nama, lipi yomuva, rākiyāva samāṅgin petunu tōruvan dedeneku gē nam hā lipiyomu hā hārena nila daruvāṭa diya

1. Para basekin läbennē para hädiyāveki. Para basekā vadan Hela basē bahulavē da, ē vaharavana Helayā novahal haṅgumen tora vē. Eviṭa kavara vimsu nuvana da, kavara nimavu hakiyāva da, kavara pati haṅguma da, kavara nidahas sitivilla da? (Emgalanta Rajaya, p. 8).

2. Ibid., p. 9.

yutu yi. E dedenāgen ekek nama salakava yi.
Anekā nama tiraya yi. Nam pat samangin pavum
eksiya panahak tāmpat viya yutu yi. Patuvāṭa
erehi vā vena ekeku idiripāt vunu vitē dī, māti-
varanaye dī sānda dun siyalu denā gen aṭen ekaka
sānda oḥṭa labunot āpaya lābe (p. 37)

This quotation sufficiently illustrates the inapplicability and unsuitability of the Helese idiom, and lexicon to present a subject which is not known to the Sinhalese linguistic community. A large number of words which have been in frequent use are rejected in this work and are replaced by Elu forms coined on the basis of Helese doctrine, i.e., not on sound linguistic reasoning but on some arbitrary arguments and dogmatisms. Consider the following words:

(in the majority usage)

<u>viduva</u>	- 'science'	<u>vidyāva</u>
<u>saduva</u>	- 'constitution'	<u>vyavasthāva</u>
<u>Bim Kosuva</u>	- 'geography'	<u>Bhūgola Vidyāva</u>
<u>Sat Lakuva</u>	- 'zoology'	<u>Jīva Vidyāva</u>
<u>Pela Matura</u>	- 'parliament'	<u>parlimēntuva</u>
<u>kilitta</u>	- 'cabinet'	<u>kābinat mandalaya</u>
<u>pili</u>	- 'parties'	<u>pakṣa</u>
<u>patuvā</u>	- 'candidate'	<u>apēkṣakayā</u>
<u>geraku</u>	- 'economic'	<u>ārthika</u>
<u>sāhāliyāva</u>	- 'socialism'	<u>samāja vādaya</u>
<u>rājāyīma</u>	- 'rule'	<u>pālanaya</u>

It is evident that most of the above words have been coined on D. V. Richard De Silva's dogmatic reasoning but not on careful consideration of the existing linguistic usage. Consequently, the majority of his invented words tend only to lead to laughter and confusion. De Silva's persistent refusal to utilize at least certain Sinhalese words which have been in use in colloquial Sinhalese as well as in school text-books for a long time, is difficult to understand. The linguistic features employed in his work, therefore, appear as purely literary elaborations, functioning extraneous to the linguistic competence of the Sinhalese and also to the proper understanding of the subject.

Kumaratunga started to strictly adhere to the use of Heja forms in his writings after 1939 but he never used this 'Helese' language in his grammatical works or in his literary appreciations to R. Tennakon's works and the works of other followers. Neither Jayanta Wirasekara nor R. Tennakon recommended the exclusive use of Helese language in their serious writings. But Kumaratunga's own devoted pupils and

more recent followers such as D. V. Richard De Silva, Arisen Ahubudu, Alavuisi Sabihela and Abiram Gamheva have wished to adopt it for all literary and non-literary needs of contemporary society, by which they seek to emancipate the Sinhalese race (rāsa) and language (basa). This is one of the major factors that has led the anti-Hela sections to refer to them as 'lunatics' and 'empty-headed'.¹

1. See Martin Wickramasingha, Nava Padya Simhalaya, p. 14; Gunadasa Amarasekara, Aliyā saha Andhayo, pp. 107-108; Chandradasa Mahānāma, 'After Kumara-tunga - The Vacuum', Daily News, 12 July 1966, pp. 4-5; see also pp. 284-287 below.

CHAPTER VIII
RECENT PHASES OF THE
HELA MOVEMENT

Munidasa Kumaratunga, as has been evident, was the main sustainer of the Hela movement, and the removal of his charismatic leadership with his death in 1944 removed its kernel. Since then the Hela movement has increasingly entered on the path of gradual decline.

The policy of Kumaratunga by the final phases of his career was to adopt 'pure Sinhalese' - absolutely free from Pali and Sanskrit borrowings - exclusively for all forms of writings and also for ordinary speech as well. While sticking adamantly to his dictates of purism Kumaratunga made fanatic endeavours to ridicule his critics and opponents and the academic community at large, and this amounted to what may be referred to as a personal aggrandizement.¹ It is

1. Cf. 'You ask me to give my authorities. Well, let me frankly tell you that I am my authority. Nose-ropes are meant for the bull not for the man. If

possible that to a considerable extent the influence of Kumaratunga's devoted disciples accounted for his bigoted and dictatorial type of attitude towards language and grammar and his reluctance to discard some of the fanciful theories he brought forward. Kumaratunga himself acknowledges this fact as is evidenced by the following excerpt: 'I agree with what you say. But if I change my views, I will have to throw overboard what I have already done. If I do so, my followers will desert me.'¹

On the other hand, it became apparent that by this time the language upheld by the Hela Havula as 'pure' and 'indigenous', being markedly different and remote from the language of the masses, was unsuitable to infuse and propagate the growing feelings of nationalism and patriotism. Furthermore,

you ask Einstein to quote his authorities the poor man will simply be nonplussed' (The Helio, vol. I, no. I, 1941 August, p. 8).

1. Quoted in Martin Wickramasingha, Nava Padya Simhalaya, Maharagama: Saman Press, 1957, pp. 15-16.

Kumaratunga's persistent refusal to accept the views of the vast majority of his contemporaries caused the emergence of a considerable number of antagonists, and his unorthodox pronouncements on the language of the Buddhist canon - Pali¹ - and his unbridled criticisms of the established Buddhist Order evoked the resentment of the entire Buddhist hierarchy, particularly of the learned Buddhist monks in the leading pirivenas like Vidyodaya and Vidyalankara. All these factors ultimately resulted in the diminution of the Hela Havula activities.

After the death of Kumaratunga there was no versatile member in this fraternity with sufficient erudition to take up his role as the leader. Jayantha Weerasekara who succeeded him was not a gifted literary artist nor was he known as a critic and polemist. During the life time of Kumaratunga, Weerasekara engaged mainly in compiling prefaces to Kumaratunga's works and commentaries to the poetical works of the Hela members.² But his premature death which occurred

1. See pp. 126-127 above

2. See pp. 253-256 above

shortly after that of Kumaratunga (1949) appears to have accelerated the decline of the activities of the Hela Havula. Weerasekara was followed by Rayipiyal Tennakon as the leader of this group which by this time was attenuated in vigour and membership. Tennakon's role in this group may be divided into two periods: during the life time of Kumaratunga he composed mainly poetical works,¹ subsequently he changed over to the editing of Sinhalese classics some of which had already been dealt with and elucidated by Kumaratunga.² Apart from Tennakon, the other members of this minority group - leading members are Amarasiri Gunawadu, Arisen Ahubudu, D. V. Richard de Silva, Abiram Gamheva, Alavuisi Sabihela, Vinnie Vitharana and Kodagoda Nanaloka - devoted their efforts

1. Tennakōn's poetical works were eagerly received by the members of the Hela Havula and were highly commended and recommended by Kumaratunga. See Kumaratunga's introductions to Vavuluva and Hāvilla.

2. Tennakon's editing of the Sinhalese classical works Parevi Sandesaya, Girā Sandesaya, Haṃsa Sandesaya, Sālalihinī Sandesaya and Sidat Sangarāva, which had already been done by Kumaratunga, is explained by the fact that these works were prescribed for the public examinations, such as Teachers' Final Examination, G.C.E. Ordinary Level Examination and University Entrance Examination, etc. For details see pp. 266-267 above.

to reciting eulogies and to composing exegetical details to the works of their teacher-god. They organized annual meetings not only to commemorate the death of their teacher on 2nd March but also more significantly to demolish non-conformisms that might have appeared in the writings of the year. The constant target of their criticisms were the language departments of the University of Ceylon which thwarted their ambitions to a considerable degree. Moreover, with the rapid expansion of the university education and, especially, the introduction of modern linguistic thought into Sinhalese language studies, the activities of this small minority began to fade away. And the sudden death of R. Tennakon (1964), then the only capable writer of this group, brought this movement to a stalemate.

The Heḷa movement which failed to accomplish its aim of readopting the grammatical features of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was in a state of recession until the late sixties when its members were confronted with an opportunity to make a new bid to fulfil their mission. With the formation of

the new government in 1965 a Sinhalese School Text Book Committee was set up.¹ This newly founded committee was entrusted with the task of compiling a series of prescriptive school text books on Sinhalese language and literature, and thirteen books were brought into publication between 1965-1969 to be used from the first grade up to the tenth.² Furthermore, the Minister of Education, I. M. R. A. Iriyagolla, appointed another committee to devise a

-
1. Rajayē Simhala Pot Kamituva. This was appointed on sole decision of the Minister of Education, I. M. R. A. Iriyagolla. Quite surprisingly, several members of the Hela Havula were included in this committee, namely Arisen Ahubudu, Alavuisi Sabihela, Vinnie Vitarana, Gunapala Senadhira, A. D. Chandrasekara and Kirti Disanayake.
 2. Simhala Mul Pota 'Sinhalese Primer' (1965); Simhala 2 (1966); Simhala 3 (1967); Simhala 4 (1967); Simhala 5 (1969); Simhala 6 (1965); Simhala 7 (1966); Simhala 8 (1966); Simhala Vyākaranaya 'Sinhalese Grammar' - Book 9 (1968); Simhala Vyākaranaya 'Sinhalese Grammar' - Book 10 (1969); Simhala Sāhityaya - Purātana Gadya Sāhityaya 'Classical Sinhalese Prose' (1966); Simhala Sāhityaya - Nūтана Gadya Sāhityaya 'Sinhalese Literature - Modern Sinhalese Prose' (1966) and Simhala Sāhityaya - Padya Sāhityaya 'Sinhalese Literature - Poetry' (1968).

Standard Sinhalese Grammar¹ suitable to be prescribed and as the authoritative / impeccable guide for educational, governmental and all other literary publications. It is interesting to observe that the majority of the members of this 'Standard Sinhalese Committee' were also chosen from the Hela fraternity.² Although the Minister of Education who appointed the committee and the prominent Hela Havula members of the committee belonged to different political persuasions, there was close collaboration between the two on this particular occasion.³ It is also of interest to

1. Sammata Simhalaya.

2. The committee consisted of fourteen members, namely, Prof. D. E. Hettiaratchi (Chairman), Prof. (Ven.) Kotahene Pannakitti, Ven. Kodagoda Nānaloka, Ven. Navasigahavatte Silananda, Ven. Labugama Lamkananda, Peter P. Abeysekara, D. G. Kulatunga, Amarasiri Gunawardhana, R. S. Tenabadu, Mahanama Disanayaka, Piyasena Nissanka, Vinnie Vitharana, A. V. Suraweera and A. D. Chandrasekara (Secretary), of whom six belonged to the Hela Havula (They are underlined) including its leader, Amarasiri Gunawardhana. Ven. Labugama Lamkananda and R. S. Tenabadu are commanders of the Hela Havula activities.

3. The Minister belonged to the most rightwing party in the country (United National Party), and one purist member of the committee was a communist and another a Trotskyite.

note that the secretaryship of the committee was conferred upon a Hela member (A. D. Chandrasekara). Paradoxically, in selecting members for this committee none of the university lecturers who have specialized in modern linguistics were taken into account nor were the educational psychologists whose participation in such linguistic and pedagogical decision making programmes is indispensable. Apart from being the true guardians of the Hela doctrine, the six members of the Hela Havula do not appear to^{have}/show many distinctive achievement in the domain of Sinhalese language or literature which could have persuaded the Minister to select them. It can therefore be reasonably supposed that the choosing of six members from a purist group which had already been cut off from the main stream of Sinhalese literary activity was motivated simply by the fact that the Minister himself had a high esteem for Kumaratunga and the linguistic creed he endeavoured to diffuse.¹ For the members

1. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolla was a journalist and a writer before coming into politics. Even after became a member of parliament (1948), he continued as a short story writer and novelist. His works

of the Hela Havula, this unprecedented opportunity to legislate their linguistic ideal was unimaginably fortunate. Although Munidasa Kumaratunga and his devoted followers had attempted whole-heartedly to present their Hela doctrine as 'genuine' and 'the unmistakable way' to fortify the Sinhalese nation, their failure to make it acceptable to the Sinhalese society at large was manifest. The linguistic

include Dēva Tāpaya (1943), Katā Paha (1945), Dēva Varaya (1947), Manu Tāpaya (1953), Purna Viplavaya (1959) and Sudarśanaya (1964) - Essays on various topics. In most of his works, the utilization of some of the archaic grammatical features resuscitated by Kumaratunga is easily noticeable. This may be exemplified by the following quotation: Jagat rūmatīyan gē rūsiri siyalla ekkotā anā kalatā perāgat sārāyen parimandāyaya vūvak vāni a gē rū sapuva vānimata mā basa asāranaya. Aya vata digāti yā, gana ran pāta yā. Eheyin saṇdek hō piyumek hō iṭa uvam novē. A gē ukula riya sakak se novāta yā; no da visāla yā (Katā Paha, p. 3). Iriyagolla, it is evident, was a great admirer of the linguistic policy of Kumaratunga. For instance, see his speech delivered on 2nd March 1948 - to commemorate the fourth anniversary of Kumaratunga's death - (published in Kumāratunga Munidāsa, ed. Sitinamaluve Sumanaratana, pp. 320-322) where he asserts: 'The name of Munidasa Kumaratunga will be remembered by future generations for the inestimable service he has done to emancipate and to dignify our language (Sinhalese)'.

features resuscitated by the Hela Havula as 'pure' and 'elegant', unable to embed themselves in the mainstream of contemporary literary activity, remained as idiosyncratic usages limited to this group. But the opportunity created by the government enabled several members of this group to be involved in linguistic norm making, and they were confronted with a promising way of introducing a number of Hela specialities into the majority usage regardless of the consensus of opinion of society.

The Hela Havula linguistic reformatory movement which was declining rapidly gained an opportunity of reviving itself when the compilation of this series of Sinhalese school text books was entrusted to them.¹ Since the adoption of these text books was to be done by means of a government directive, they got a golden opportunity to publicise their outmoded grammatical rules and style. It is evident

1. The Hela Havula did not get such an opportunity when Kumaratunga was living.

that the motive and the intention of Kumaratunga also was to use the school front to propagate his views among the teachers and to influence the pupils through them, but he never gained an opportunity for this during his career.¹ The two grammars he wrote - Kriyā Vivaraṇaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya -, the result of, according to him, long and sustained effort, were never adopted as school texts.

It is evident that those members of the Hela Havula who were appointed to the Sinhalese School Text Book Committee got the opportunity to make their views triumph over the others.² In all these books

-
1. Kumaratunga was a strong critic of the then Education Department. For instance, reproaching the Department of Education for designing a system of education with a view to producing men and women with a slavish mentality, he says 'The Department has done and are (sic) still doing everything to make the language grammaless, graceless, powerless and worthless' (The Helio, vol. I, nos. 9 and 10 (1941), p. 70). See also pp. 135-136 above.
 2. It seems relevant to note that although there were fourteen members in this committee, only eleven members actually took part in decision making. One of the clerical members, Prof. (Ven.) Kotahene Pannakitti, was unable to attend the meetings regularly on account of illness and two other lay members, too, were irregular in attendance. This information I gathered from the Chairman of this committee, Prof. D. E. Hettiaratchi, then the Head of the Department of Sinhalese, University of Ceylon.

starting from the grade one reader (Siṁhala 1) to the final one (Siṁhala 13) the Hela Havula specialities are abundantly interwoven. A distinctive feature in this series is that whenever grammatical rules, especially those of syntax, are explained, examples from the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, the apotheosis of Sinhalese grammar according to the members of the Hela school, are profusely quoted,¹ but it is significant that the Hoṇḍa Siṁhala written by R. Tennakon, the most prominent member of the Hela Havula after Kumaratunga, is not referred to at all.

While condemning the modern written and spoken language as completely lawless and worthless, this series introduces as 'genuine' and 'absolutely correct' the phonological and grammatical features of the classical works (12th - 14th centuries) which had been resurrected by Kumaratunga. These books adopt the use of final a - obsolete phonological and grammatical feature - which had been enunciated by Kumaratunga

1. See pp. 300-301 below.

as the distinctive feature of the Hela language,¹ and was used by his followers in their works. In the works of the Hela Havula the resuscitated ä seems to have the following functions:²

- (i) (Inanimate) locative case marker
- (ii) past participle marker
- (iii) sentence final marker
- (iv) emphatic particle marker
- (v) with certain indeclinables
- (vi) conditional verb marker.

Because of the use of this unnecessary ä the language of these text books looks artificial and unreal. The use of ä as referred to above was found in literary works of the 12th - 14th centuries but not at all in modern written Sinhalese. It has gone into disuse with the normal language evolution. Therefore forceful re-introduction of this feature could be reckoned as an attempt to complicate the modern written Sinhalese usage.³ The aim of a series of text books such

1. See pp. 120-121 above.

2. For details see pp. 120-121 above.

3. It is the introduction of this unnecessary ä that aroused the fierce criticism of the non-purists. However, it is noteworthy that in the many books

as this should be to give the readers (pupils) a correct and scientific understanding of the language and its function; but the attempt to teach the grammatical rules and the literary style of a negligible minority who hold the erroneous view that the grammar and style of the classical works of a distant past are inherently 'purer' should be considered deleterious. The following examples illustrate how ä is forcefully and unnecessarily inserted:

Modern written Sinhalese usage

<u>pādāvīma</u>	(4: 22,65)	-	<u>pādavīma</u>
<u>gāvāsena</u>	(2: 4, 20)	-	<u>gāvasena</u>
<u>pārādā</u>	(1: 8, 12)	-	<u>pārada</u>
<u>vānāseti</u>	(4: 7, 48)	-	<u>vānaseti</u>
<u>nāvātā</u>	(2: 50,51)	-	<u>nāvata</u>
<u>gasā</u>	(7: 44,49)	-	<u>gasē</u>
<u>atā</u>	(10:22,27)	-	<u>atē</u>
<u>kalā</u>	(13: 4, 7)	-	<u>kala</u>
<u>dan mā</u>	(8: 40,54)	-	<u>dan ma</u>
<u>basā</u>	(9: 30,37)	-	<u>basa</u>

for children that Kumaratunga wrote he has not used the ä in all the environments referred to above. This may be illustrated by the following example: Eheyin adda(ä) yutu de ada(ä), biñda(ä) yutu dē bindā(ä), kādiya(ä) yutu dē kaḍā, poḍi kala yutu dē poḍi kota(ä), kese namut hē birindā laṅgata giyē ya(ä) (Hīn Sāraya, p. 2).

Another such phonological feature - a Heḷa Havula idiosyncratic usage - forcefully introduced to this series is -ya which is obligatorily added to a category of loan stems. The compilers of these text books argue that whenever a Pali or Sanskrit stem is loaned to Sinhalese, either y or v is 'augmented'.¹ This is not a conclusion that they had arrived at by analysing the actual modern language, but an artificial rule they have devised by argument and postulation based on ancient literary usage. Vidyālaya 'college' may be adduced as an example. According to the above dictum, it should be written as vidyālayaya - vidyālaya+y+a. Their argument is that vidyālaya is a Sanskrit stem and it should be Sinhalized by infixing

1. Sakuyen hō Pāliyen hō ā padayak Sīmhala ūruvata vibat gānvīmēdi piyeviyata t vibatata t atarē y, v yana dekin ekak āgamaya vīma rītiyayi. In 'y' āgamaya bahulayi: Udāharana, vidyālayaya, viṣayaya, samayaya . . . Samayaya, viṣayaya ā tanhi ya yannak vādi sē ayek salakati. Ehet ē vādiyek novē. Tibiya yutteki 'Whenever a word is loaned from Pali or Sanskrit, a y or v should be infixed between the stem and the ending. Of y and v, the infixation of y is more frequent. Example: vidyālayaya 'college', viṣayaya 'subject', samayaya 'religion'. Some regard the infixed ya as redundant. But it is not redundant, it should be there' (Sīmhala 9, pp. 121-122).

another y. But these authors do not recognize the fact that in such instances an obligatory deletion rule operates in modern Sinhalese. Therefore, an occurrence of y after a penultimate y is not found in modern Sinhalese (Though it is true that in the literary works written about 500 - 700 years ago no such deletion is evident). This again is an attempt to reverse the normal language behaviour.

An attempt to introduce this unnecessary ya even into spoken Sinhalese can be seen in the following sentences taken from dialogues:

Ēka da? ē dū Hindu devālayayak (4:34)

'Oh, that, it is a Hindu temple, daughter'

Ē āgamaya iḡannuvā (4:37)

'That religion was taught'

But in the actual speech of the people no such ya could be traced. With their dogmatic arguments for 'which is correct' and 'which ought to be there' the adherents of the Heḷa Havula never have a place for actual Sinhalese usage, either written or spoken, and it is this authoritarianism that has prevented the Sinhalese School Text Books Series from being realistic.

There are certain other phonological peculiarities, which are not observable at all in modern usage, included in these books under the label 'normative'. Instead of analysing the actual linguistic features and arriving at rules to account for their behaviour, the compilers of these books try to invent the language according to a preconceived grammatical framework and thereby distort the normal pattern. This can be illustrated by the following examples:

(1) In modern usage	-	(2) In the Series
<u>hemin hemin</u>		<u>hemen hemen</u> (2:77)
<u>perahāra</u>		<u>perahara</u> (2:37)
<u>kavadāvat</u>		<u>kavaradāvat</u> (3:38)
<u>velaṇḍāma</u>		<u>veleṇḍāma</u> (4:12)
<u>Samanala</u>		<u>Samanola</u> (3:11)
<u>anik</u>		<u>anek</u> (5:14)
<u>priti vuna</u>		<u>prita vuna</u> (5:37)
<u>nagiddi</u>		<u>nāgeddi</u> (5:74)
<u>Kolaṁbin</u>		<u>Kolōmbin</u> (6:18)
<u>padaviya</u>		<u>padeviya</u> (6:24)
<u>gedara</u>		<u>gedora</u> (6:30)
<u>vanaye</u>		<u>venē</u> (7:10)
<u>vāradi</u>		<u>vārādi</u> (8:95)
<u>magiyā</u>		<u>māṅgiyā</u> (9: 4)

The forms in column (1) are altered to be in consonance with the ancient literary usage. Thus they reckon the

modern literary usage as 'incorrect'. In these instances only the forms that are found in the works of the 12th - 14th centuries have been regarded as 'pure' and 'proper', but the fact that these forms have assumed their present shape as a result of the normal language evolution, these purists do not concede.

In these text books, most misconceptions of the Hela Havula are centred round the morphological and syntactic features. Although the aim of these books is to enable the student to read and write Sinhalese correctly, the students are introduced to a series of obsolete grammatical rules and an outmoded language and style. Further, it appears, they inculcate a very fallacious and unscientific idea of grammar. The majority of the statements and the examples on grammatical categories such as sandhi, derivative nouns, compounds, verbs and indeclinables included in this series are taken from the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya and some sections have

been copied directly.¹ Most of the examples cited to illustrate the normative usage are taken from the traditional Sinhalese literary works, more particularly poetical works.²

The description of the inflection of inanimate plural nouns in these texts is entirely contrary to the modern written usage, either prose or poetry, and what is given as the correct form is the reflection of the practices of classical Sinhalese writers. Although there was no overt plural marker for the inanimate nouns in ancient Sinhalese, by about the tenth century the suffix -val seems to have been added for that function, and it has been maintained as a regular feature in prose ever since. In poetry, however, this suffix is not found until as late as

-
1. For example, compare the description of 'The derivation of feminine stems' in the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 100-103, with that of Siṃhala 10, pp. 60-63. Cf. also Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 31-37 (verbal categories); pp. 309-320 (taddhita) with Siṃhala 9 pp. 99-106; pp. 50-55; pp. 170-174 and Siṃhala 8, pp. 130-133; 170-173.
 2. This series abounds with examples from Amāvatura, Butsarana, Dharmapradīpikā, Kavsilumina, Sasadāva, Mayura Sandēśaya, Sālalihinī Sandēśaya, Guttīla Kāvya and Kāvyaśekhara.

the fifteenth century. Before the occurrence of the plural marker -val the plurality of the inanimate noun had been obtained by prefixing an ordinal to the noun,¹ if the noun stem ends with a, or otherwise by zero affixation. But this system is not found in modern Sinhalese. Paradoxically, these text books maintain, to a great extent, the above outmoded practice.

Example: Maha rata kīpayak(4:8)

(Modern usage - Maha raṭavaḷ kīpayak)

Svabhavika varāya lova attē ekak nātnam
dekak pamanayi (5:47)

(Modern usage - varāyavaḷ)

In the above examples the reader will not get the plurality easily if the context and such other factors do not come to the rescue.

The employment of plural marker -val is allowed in certain places in these books, but its reduplication is not permitted. Consequently, the normal

1. Example: de rata 'two countries', satara paya 'four bowls'.

usages gevalvala, pāraavalvala, raṭavalvalin etc.

are treated as erroneous.¹ No reasons for this refusal have been adduced. It may be observed however that the occurrence of the suffix val either singly or doubly in normal modern Sinhalese is determined according to the nature of the stem involved: (1) Inanimate noun stems ending in a or ā take the suffix val for all cases and (2) the other stems take the suffix val from case 2 onwards. In class (1) stems, the suffix val is reduplicated when it takes the case 2 suffix and remains unchanged with the rest of the cases.

Example:	singular	-	plural
(1) case 1	kaṭa+∅		kaṭa+ <u>val</u>
case 2	kaṭa+in	-	kaṭa+ <u>val</u> + <u>val</u> +in
case 3	kaṭa+ṭa	-	kaṭa+ <u>val</u> + <u>val</u> +a+ṭa
case 4	kaṭa+e	-	kaṭa+ <u>val</u> + <u>val</u> +a

1. According to the Siṃhala 8, these forms are unacceptable and should be corrected as gevala, pāravala, raṭavalin (pp. 206-207).

	singular	-	plural
(2) case 1	gas+a	-	gas+ o
case 2	gas+in	-	gas+ <u>val</u> +in
case 3	gas+a+ṭa	-	gas+ <u>val</u> +a+ṭa
case 4	gas+e	-	gas+ <u>val</u> +a

In this category (2), the stem itself (gas) indicates the plurality. In category (1), the reduplication of the suffix val is the result of taking the plural form (case 1) as the stem. This may be explained by another example:

leḍa+val+val+in

Here leḍaval, which already has the suffix val, is taken as the base form to which a further val is added before the case inflection. The doubling of val operates in this category of noun stems due to the absence of an overt plural marker. Therefore in current Sinhalese the reduplication of the suffix val is a regular feature in the inanimate noun paradigm, which has been ignored by the compilers of these text books.

Another instance of utilizing an obsolete morphological feature is the addition of suffix -ek in the nominative case to denote indefiniteness in

inanimate nouns. In modern written Sinhalese to denote indefiniteness in masculine, feminine and neuter nouns, the following suffixes are used:

Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
case 1 -ek	-ak	-ak
case 2 -aku	-aka	-ak

Example: miniseek 'a man' gahaniyaak 'a woman' malaak
'a flower'

There are a few exceptions to this rule - a few inanimate nouns also take the -ek ending. Example: itteek 'a draughtsman', ibbeek 'a padlock', belleek 'a shell', bōnikkeek 'a doll'. The reason for this is that the Sinhalese people are accustomed to treat them as animate, although they are really not so. Apart from the above few instances, the suffix -ak is confined to inanimate objects, and sometimes it is the ending that signifies whether the given noun is a thing or a person. This may be illustrated by the following examples:

ledek 'a patient'
leḍak 'an illness'
kaviyeek 'a poet'
kaviyaak 'a poem'

amutt <u>ek</u>	'a stranger'
amutt <u>ak</u>	'a strange thing'
vahale <u>ek</u>	'a slave'
vahala <u>ak</u>	'a help' or 'a roof'

This regular feature found in current written Sinhalese usage is rejected in this series and the ancient literary usage, which was resurrected by Kumaratunga, is adhered to instead. In classical Sinhalese, the indefiniteness of the inanimate noun in nominative case was indicated by the suffix -ek, which was identical with the animate (mas.) suffix. But with the advent of time the indefinite suffix -ek seems to have been restricted to masculine gender and the suffix -ak to the neuter gender. But the writers of these text books do not concede that the category of definiteness should be modified with the continually changing linguistic habits. Therefore the ancient use of the suffix -ek is respected throughout in this series. Consider the following examples:

- kuṃbukeek kōhi da? (2:110)
 e tāna maha valeki (2:110)
 Kavsekarayē ena kuḍā kavīyeki e (4:55)
 ē Laṃka guvan sevāvaṭa ayiti ekeki (4:86)

me atuṭa leḍek nāti (4:74)
 Liyar raja naluveki (7:152)
 sarva nāmayata ālapanayek nāti (8:48)

In some of the above examples, the meaning is not easily conveyed and most of these expressions tend to lead to laughter. For example the expression Liyar raja naluveki may be cited. In this sentence the word naluveki is used to mean 'a play'. But the ordinary meaning is 'an actor'. This ambiguity is an artificially created one due to an unbounded faith in the bygone linguistic practices. To any speaker of Sinhalese the above type of construction will no doubt seem very artificial.

Another suffix mutilated this way, to conform to the Helese doctrine, is -anṭa. In modern usage this indicates a dative plural of animate nouns. This suffix is changed in these books into -anaṭa. According to the dicta of these texts (8:68; 9:43), articulation of ṭa after n is impossible and hence n is changes to na. It is strange to observe that these men, whose linguistic policy is to condemn the living speech as 'lawless' and 'corrupted' and to remould it in accordance with the written Sinhalese

(ancient) norms, here attempt to modify a current written Sinhalese usage on the basis of some phonetic reasoning. It is evident that whenever it is difficult for the members of the Hela Havula to establish their preconceived grammatical rules by considering only the written usage, they have not hesitated to rely on some hypothetical phonetic reasoning. They have thus deformed a normal written Sinhalese usage by basing themselves on a hypothetical rule relating to ordinary speech.¹ In spoken Sinhalese, the words minisunṭa 'to men', daruvanṭa 'to children', ballanṭa 'to dogs' and kurullanṭa 'to birds' are normal, and they never occur as minisunata, daruvanata, ballanata etc. as given in these texts. Such forms inevitably appear to be artificial and outlandish.

Example: ovunata 'to them' (4:2,5,13)
 daruvanata 'to children' (4:7,19)
 ballanata 'to dogs' (5:20)
 saturanata 'to enemies' (7:42)

1. For details, see p. 155-156 above.

In these text books the current usage of some personal pronouns is distorted and castigated as 'wrong', and outmoded usage is presented as 'normative'.

(1) oba 'you'

This is a second person singular pronoun which is used frequently in modern written Sinhalese, irrespective of sex, and the finite verb it takes occurs in the same person.

Example: Oba yannehida? 'Are you going'

But this pronoun is employed in these books as a third person plural noun while a second person meaning is intended.

Example: Oba ugat'ha 'You (Pl.) are learned' (4:14)
Oba daniti 'You (Pl.) are aware' (5:44)
Oba samat'ha 'You (Pl.) are clever' (7:28)

It is true that the pronoun oba has occurred in ancient literary works in the above manner but never to indicate a second person meaning. It was a third person pronoun. However, during the course of time the original sense of this pronoun seems to have been forgotten, and it has been modified in meaning and function, though it still retains the original phonological shape. The members of the Hela Havula consider

the current usage of this form as a corruption and strictly stick to the traditional practice. What is presented in this series as the norm of the usage of oba is neither the proper ancient practice nor the current literary Sinhalese usage but an idiosyncratic linguistic habit limited to the Heḷa Havula.

(ii) ohu 'he'

This pronoun frequently occurs in current written usage to denote third person singular sense and its corresponding plural form is ovuhu. This pronoun is employed in these works as a nominative plural form. The reason for their predilection for this unfamiliar usage is that it had occurred so in the literary works of the 12th - 14th centuries.¹ This is again a disapprobation of the existing linguistic practice due to a blind faith in the correctness of the classical masters. The modern literary usage of this pronoun and how its usage ought to be, in accordance with these text books, are as follows:

1. See for instance, Ohu nuvara balā . . . mahat peraharin mahat pirivarin vadit (Amāvatura, ed. Kodāgoda Nānāloka, p. 20).

(a) The modern literary usage:

	singular	-	plural
case 1	ohu		ovuhu
case 2	ohu		ovun
case 3	ohuṭa		ovunṭa
case 4	ohugē		ovungē

(b) The method adopted in these books is:¹

	singular	-	plural
case 1	he		ohu
case 2	ohu		ovun
case 3	ohuṭa		ovunaṭa
case 4	ohu gē		ovun gē

According to the system introduced in these books, the student has to bear in mind, unnecessarily, that the pronoun ohu is used in plural sense in one context and in singular in another. In addition, a new form, which has no resemblance to the rest of the forms in the paradigm, will have to be brought in to

1. Siṃhala 9, pp. 97-98. Cf. also Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 151.

denote the singularity in case 1. Thus a current linguistic feature which seems to have been simplified and systematized many years ago is obfuscated in this series due to the puristic precepts of the Heḷa Havula under which these texts have been moulded.

(iii) ä and äya 'she'

These two personal pronouns (feminine) are very frequent and regular usages in modern Sinhalese. The equivalent ancient form of this was ō which is now obsolete. In this series of books, however, the outmoded ō is given as correct¹ but the reasons for such assertion are not stated.

It is in the analysis of the verb that these authors seem to have disregarded the current written Sinhalese usage to the greatest extent. The detailed description of the verbal forms contained in the Siṃhala 9 (pp. 50-56) and in Siṃhala 8 (pp. 77-81) has been extracted from Kumaratunga's Vyākaraṇa

1. Siṃhala 8, p. 20, p. 37, pp. 40-42. For example see ō kukus sitin magata batu (4:96).

Vivaranaya.¹ As has been pointed out,² the majority of the forms of Kumaratunga's Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya are now obsolete and were taken from the literary works of the 12th - 14th centuries. But the compilers of these texts without considering the apparent obsolescence of these verbs intermingle them with the current usage. Consequently, their constructions have turned out to be bizarre and artificial. Consider the following sentences.

- (1) Mava podi dekaḥ bāṇḍa gatu (5:31)
(Modern literary usage: Mava podi dekaḥ bāṇḍa gattāya)
- (2) Sama ran abarana palanu (2:17)
(Modern literary usage: Sāma ran abaraṇa pālaṇḍa gattāya)
- (3) Guru tuma magaṭa baṭi (4:110)
(Modern literary usage: Guru tumā magaṭa bāssēya)

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 217-227.

2. See pp. 245-248 above.

- (4) Dedena ma gal gäsī nāvatunu (4:97)

(Modern literary usage: Dedenā ma gal gäsī
nāvatunōya)

- (5) Mārī vidyā upadhiyak ladu (4:147)

(Modern literary usage: Marī vidyā upadhiyak
lābuvāya)

The above verbs being so archaic even tend to obfuscate the intended meaning. The paradigm of the Sinhalese verb is also exemplified by using a set of verbal forms which are non-existent:¹

Example:

<u>non-past</u>		<u>past</u>	
sing.	plural	sing.	plural
Third person : bamā - bamati		bimī - bumū	
Second person: bamahi- bamahu		bimīhi - bimūhu	
First person : bamami- bamamu		bimīmi - bimūmu	
Third person : dāhē - dāheti		dāhiṇi - dāhuṇu	
Second person: dāhehi- dahehu		dāhiṇihi dāhuṇuhu	
First person : dāhemi- dāhemu		dāhiṇimi dāhuṇumu	

1. See Sinhala 9, pp. 51-52; see also Sinhala 10, pp. 52-54.

The most misleading section of this description is the conjugation of verbs in the past tense, where the forms given are not observable at all in modern written Sinhalese. Consider the following conjugations:¹

	<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
(1) Third person : baṭi	-	baṭu
Second person : baṭihi	-	baṭuhu
First person : baṭimi	-	baṭumu
(2) Third person : vani	-	vanu
Second person : vanihi	-	vanuhu
First person : vanimi	-	vanumu
(3) Third person : paḷani	-	paḷanu
Second person : paḷanihi-		paḷanuhu
First person : paḷanimi-		paḷanumu

In modern literary usage:

	<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
(1) Third person : bāssēya	-	bāssōya
Second person : bāssehi	-	bāssehu
First person : bāssemi	-	bāssemu

1. Siṃhala 9, pp. 53-54; see also Siṃhala 7, p. 28, Siṃhala 10, pp. 50-57.

	singular		plural
(2)	Third person : vādunēya	-	vādunōya
	Second person : vādunehi	-	vādunehu
	First person : vādunemi	-	vādunemu
(3)	Third person : pālāndēya	-	pālāndōya
	Second person : pālāndehi	-	pālāndehu
	First person : pālāndemi	-	pālāndemu

It should be mentioned that in present day literary Sinhalese the occurrence of second person verbal forms is infrequent and they have almost disappeared. For instance, a sentence like Tepi vāda karahu 'Are you (pl.) working?' is not observable at all. This fact should be stated in an analysis of the category of the Sinhalese verb, particularly in a work which is especially intended for the use of schools. But the authors of these text books do not pay any attention to the actual function of verbs in modern Sinhalese, nor do they take the frequency of occurrence factor into consideration in their exposition. Instead they adhere to the dicta presented in Kumaratunga's works Kriyā Vivaraṇaya and Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya which were largely based on the resuscitated linguistic habits of the 12th - 14th century literary Sinhalese. Therefore,

what is analysed as the verb morphology of current Sinhalese in these books is a completely misleading and erroneous picture.

Not only are the majority of verbs presented in these books outmoded, but also the few that are taken from the current usage are mutilated. Example: balā, kaḍā, kapā, damā, natā.¹ The forms such as kapā, kaḍā etc. given in these books do not occur in modern written Sinhalese as finite verbs. The verbal suffix -a is used to form past participles, and it has no characteristics of finite sense. The following examples will illustrate how the sense of finiteness is maintained formally:

<u>kaḍā</u> -	(verb stem)	-	<u>kada</u> +min	(present participle)
			<u>kada</u>	(past participle)
			<u>kada</u> +yi	(finite verb present tense)

The verbal suffix a is distinctively marked for its non-finiteness and therefore an example like Lamayā

1. Siṁhala 10, pp. 53-55.

nāṭum balā (10:55)¹ indicates an incomplete action - balā in this example is a past participle. The view of these authors that the forms like gayā, natā etc. ^{be} can/pure finite verbs cannot be accepted on formal criteria.

The description of the indeclinables and their use in these books corresponds with the system adopted exclusively by the Heḷa Havula. In these texts the modern usage of the indeclinables is suppressed in two ways: (1) Deforming of the indeclinables that are frequently used in current literary Sinhalese (2) The employment of obsolete forms in place of others. Alterations to the indeclinables which are commonly used are made by adding an unnecessary phonological feature, i. e., a.

Example:

<u>nävatä</u>	(2:18)	- modern usage: <u>nävata</u>
		'again'
<u>misä</u>	(5:8)	- modern usage: <u>misa</u>
		'except'
<u>mä</u>	(6:17)	- modern usage: <u>ma</u>
		'emphatic particle'
<u>pinisä</u>	(6:57)	- modern usage: <u>pinisa</u>
		'for'

1. Consider also the following examples: Däriya gĩ

Other indeclinables have been altered according to the ancient traditional usage.

Example:

<u>nitora</u>	(6:21)	- modern usage:	<u>nitara</u>
			'often'
<u>ekbiti</u>	(4:74)	- modern usage:	<u>ikbiti</u>
			'then'
<u>naraturu</u>	(2:8)	- modern usage:	<u>niraturu</u>
			'often'
<u>itikin</u>	(10:8)	- modern usage:	<u>itin</u>
			'so'

Several indeclinables included in this series of books are not found at all in modern literary usage.

Example: pāsulu (8:31) - modern usage: pasuva 'later'
nahamak (9:7) - modern usage: no 'do not'
esā (9:11) - modern usage: epamana
'that much'
kesā (8:48) - modern usage: kopamana
'how much'
vali (10:8) - modern usage: nāvata
'again'

The above particles have gone into disuse since the end of the Kotte period which marked the end of the

gayā (8:22); Minisā avata siri narambā (3:11); Sumanā
dara kapā (6:44).

classical Sinhalese prose and poetic tradition. These were resuscitated by Kumaratunga for his linguistic reformatory endeavours. But it is significant that though Kumaratunga has utilized the above indeclinables in his poetical works and his earlier prose works, none of these features can be found in the works, either prose or poetry, he especially wrote for children.¹

The usage of the conjunctive particle hā is also altered to be in conformity with the traditional norm. For instance, the particle hā is used twice immediately after each of the nouns which are being conjoined, whereas in modern usage it occurs only once.

Example: Namaṭa hā diya bīmaṭa hā gaṅgaṭa basinā
toṭupala (2:106)

Amutuma penīmak hā dēśagunayak hā āti
pedesakaṭa (4:81)

Pittalehi hā paḷiṅguvehi hā koṭā tibunu (8:64)

This unusual occurrence of the particle hā 'and' has obscured the meaning of the above sentences to a

1. For example, see his Kiyavana Nuvana and Sikṣā Mārgaya.

considerable extent. It is evident that the above examples have not been taken from the actual usage of the language but are the result of postulation and argument on the basis of a bygone linguistic practice.

The description of syntax and the structural patterns presented in these texts are by far the most erroneous and misleading - what is presented may be referred to as an attempt to put the linguistic clock back. Due to their boundless faith in the 'correctness' and 'purity' of the literary works of the 12th - 14th centuries, these authors model their sentences on the syntactic constructions and features of the works of this period on one hand, and complicate the widely accepted pattern on the other. This may be illustrated by the following sentences:

- (a) *Hari uttaraya ō nodatu, ē danagannaṭa kāmāti
bava āṅga vū (4:2)
- (b) *⁻Ō tātta pamā āyidāyi sessan varin vara
vimasayi (4:11)
- (c) *Vidyāvet kalāvet diyuṇuven minis guṇa vagāva
diyuṇuvē da piriḥē da hō? (4:59)

* Indicates an unacceptable sentence.

- (d) *Veleṇḍō lāhen vī minū (8:21)
- (e) *Kella diyaṭa giyā diya gena eyi (10:20)
- (f) *Haṇḍek ohu gē kanē vani (4:94)
- (g) *Marī vidyā upādhiyak ladū (4:147)
- (h) *Balalā miyā māreyi (8:106)
- (i) *Balalun miyō ālleti (8:107)
- (j) *Ohu visin mama bālemi (9:87)
- (k) *Mā visin tō bālehi (9:88)

In the above examples, it can be seen, that some of the sentences have been formed by mixing the archaic grammatical rules with strictly colloquial lexical items. For example, the sentence (a) has three colloquial lexical items, i.e., hari 'correct', uttaraya 'answer' and dānagannata 'to know', whereas the syntactic structure of this is purely of the pre-fifteenth century nature. The finite verbs nodatu and āṅgāvū do not occur in modern written Sinhalese at all; the formal characteristics of the finite verb in current literary Sinhalese are not observable in them (Their normal occurrences are nodattāya/nodattiya 'did not know' and āṅgavūvāya 'hinted'). In sentence (b) the noun sessan 'others' is used with the verb

vimasayi 'inquires' without an ablative case marker. This is not observable at all in modern written, or in spoken, Sinhalese. In modern literary usage the ablative case, expressed with the addition of the morphemes -gen, -keren and -vetin, is always found with such a verb. The absence of this functor in the above sentence is mainly responsible for the obscurity of its meaning.

The sentence (d), *Velēṇḍō lāhen vī minū, is not grammatically acceptable. The verb minū 'measured' has been used to denote past tense plurality whereas it does not. The obsolete verbal marker -ū is frequently used in these books, following a practice adhered to in the works of Kumaratunga and those of Tennakon. As mentioned above,¹ Kumaratunga was not certain of the number of the traditional verbal suffix -ū which is found with a feminine subject, more particularly in poetry.

Example: Kalahasa mohotak mulā vā bumū
(Muvadevdava, v. 81)

1. See p. 248 above.

Nisakata giyavan vū

(Muvadevdāva, v. 84)

Bāmini liya put ruvana vādū

(Kāvyasēkharaya, v.3:7)

In the Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, however, Kumaratunga concluded that 'the past tense finite verb which occurs with a feminine subject is always plural'.¹ On this assumption the past tense finite verbs which have the suffix -ū are treated as plural in these texts. It is evident from the classical Sinhalese usage that this suffix has been used not to denote plurality but as a distinctive feature to collate with a feminine subject. But the authors of this series of texts, paying due regard to the puristic doctrine of Kumaratunga, treat the verbs minū, ladū etc. as plural. It should be noted that verbs of the above type do not occur at all in modern literary usage. The authors' usage is not only an addition of unnecessary complications to the category of verb in current

1. Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, p. 275.

Sinhalese but also a falsification of the function of a verbal suffix in classical Sinhalese literary usage.

The normal spoken language is also rejected in these books as non-standard and grammarless,¹ and the hybrid variety which was introduced by Kumara-tunga² is presented as 'prestigious' and 'normative'. This dictate is adhered to throughout in this series whenever a dialogue occurs. This may be illustrated by the following examples:

Rajatumaku hiṭṭiyā (4:12)
 Kurullaku piyāmbuvā (2:6)
 Nāviyan ruval hākuluvā (7:37)

Because of this kind of erroneous assertion on the syntactic component in Sinhalese, the users of these books will have to cope with four types of sentence structures:

(1) The syntactic structure of the current literary Sinhalese

1. See Siṃhala 7, pp. 70-72; Siṃhala 9, pp. 40-42.

2. See pp. 150-152 above.

(2) The syntactic structure of the colloquial Sinhalese

(3) The obsolete syntactic pattern of the 12th - 14th centuries introduced in these books

(4) The hybrid sentences - an idiosyncratic usage of the Hela Havula.

Not only do these authors complicate and distort the morphological and syntactic structure of modern Sinhalese but they also alter, to be in harmony with the puristic precepts of the Hela Havula, the linguistic features of the excerpts taken from the works of non-purists, such as the popular novelists W. A. Silva and Martin Wickramasinghe. It is significant, though, that the majority of the excerpts included in this series are taken from the Sinhalese classical works and from the works of the Hela Havula.¹

1. Amāvatura, Butsarana, Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, Pūjāvaliya, Umamāda, Thūpavamsaya and Saddharma-ratnāvaliya. The works of the Hela Havula include Kumaratunga's Prabandhōpadesaya, Virit Vākiya, Kiyavana Nuvana, Hin Sāraya, Prabandha Saṃgrahaya and Piya Samara; Tennakōn's Vavuluva, Hāvilla, Apē Yatagiyāva, Dā Vinaya and Bas Pāra; poems of Warakāgoda Silruvan, Hubat Disanayaka and Gunapala Senadhira.

Only two sections from the works of Martin Wickramasinghe (from Rōhini and Madol Dūva) and one from the works of W. A. Silva (from Vijayabā Kollaya) are included in this series. The underlying motivation is transparent. Because of the mutilation of the sections taken from the above works of Wickramasinghe and W. A. Silva, they appear in these books as artificial and unreal.¹

It should be evident that this series of Sinhalese School Text books which were compiled under the government decree have been modelled and designed for the most part to teach puristic precepts of a minority group. These books do not give any understanding of the fundamentals of language and the picture presented as the structure of the Sinhalese language is distorted maximally.

The compilation of a Sinhalese school reader under government orders was first undertaken in 1934.

1. Cf. Siṃhala 6, pp. 24-27 and Vijayabā Kollaya, pp. 208-212; Siṃhala 6, pp. 88-91 and Rōhini, pp. 37-41; Siṃhala 12, pp. 59-60 and Madoldūva, pp. 76-77.

This book was written by H. S. Perera¹ who was a then prominent educational psychologists and also the first Ceylonese student to receive a postgraduate training in modern linguistics. This book, though it was written some forty years ago, is designed on modern linguistic guide lines and attempts to give the student an understanding of the structure of the living language. The author, in the Preface, says that he has paid particular attention to the existing disparity between the written Sinhalese and the spoken and has attempted to explain the lessons in a language which is very familiar to the student.² However, soon after the publication of this book it met with severe criticisms from the Hela Havula.³ From the

1. Siṁhala Kiyavīm Pota (1934).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

3. Mē pota liyana laddē Siṁhala bhāsāva kāta kotā kullī kārāyan gē bhāṣavak bavata pamunuvā ē magin Siṁhalayā nīca dinayaku kotā pitarātiyan gē da ovungē mituran gē da sapattu pisa dāmimata sudusu karana adahasin ya yi kīma nivāradi yā 'This book was written in order to debase the Sinhalese language and make it the language of labourers and thereby reduce the Sinhalese man to the status of a low and mean being and make him polish the shoes of foreigners and their friends' (Lakmini Pahana, 1934 September 11, p. 1).

very outset it has been the prerogative of the Hela Havula to ridicule any attempt to examine the current Sinhalese language objectively. What is inexplicable, however, is the government's predilection for allowing a puristic minority like this, whose conception of language and grammar is so extraordinary, to decide on linguistic matters pertaining to the entire nation, especially in a period in which the study of language has advanced tremendously.

In addition to the appointment of a Sinhalese School Text Book Committee, the Minister of Education appointed another committee in 1967 and entrusted them with the task of compiling a standard Sinhalese literary grammar to be prescribed for the use of all governmental and educational publications etc.¹ It should be mentioned that this committee was not entrusted with the task of devising a full-fledged grammar for the current written Sinhalese usage. As the foreword of the report clearly indicates, the primary object of this committee was 'to prescribe a

1. For details, see pp. 298-290 above.

set of normative usages to eradicate the existing uncertainties and incongruities in written Sinhalese concerning (1) orthography (2) morphology (3) idiom (4) syntax (5) punctuation and (6) word-division'.¹

The report of this committee was published in November 1968.²

In the foreword of this report it is specifically stated that the Sinhalese language and literature up to the fifteenth century rose to the zenith of its development and then deteriorated rapidly due to the incessant European invasions on the one hand and the internal turmoil that resulted from these political events on the other. Further it goes on to say that though the great scholars and national leaders like Welivita Saranankara, Hikkaduwe Sumangala, Ratmalane

1. Siṃhala bhāṣāva livīme dī (1) akṣara vinyāsayā (2) pada sādhanaya (3) vākya prayōgaya (4) kriyā kāraka pada sambandhaya (5) virāma lakṣana (6) pada bedīma ādi karuṇu pilibāṇḍava dānāṭa pavatnā aviniscita tatvaya maṅga haravā līma saṇḍahā sammata nīti mālāvak nirdēśa kirīma (Sammata Siṃhala Vārtava, p. 13).

2. Sammata Siṃhala Vārtava, Colombo: Educational Publications Department, November 1968.

Sri Dharmarama and Munidasa Kumaratunga endeavoured wholeheartedly to uplift and dignify the Sinhalese language, it has again fallen on the path of decline, and, therefore, an immediate panacea - a standard literary grammar - for this malady is indispensable.¹ This is clearly a reflection of the resuscitatory and prescriptive linguistic policy of the Hela Havula.

It is evident from the report of this committee that out of the six categories which were originally ordered to be dealt with by the Minister, two sections, i.e., morphology and idiom, have been dropped out, and three new sections - 'the usages that need purification', 'the proper use of the indeclinables' and 'the usage of a' - have been included instead.² This is evidently an attempt to inculcate the linguistic ideal of the Hela Havula which had already been woven into the Sinhalese School Text Books series.

This committee clearly states that their prime concern was to remove the inconsistencies and

1. See Foreword, p. 2.

2. Pirisudu viya yutu vahara, Nipāta yeduma, ä kâra yōgaya.

uncertainties that are found in plenty in modern written Sinhalese.¹ But, it is evident, what they have actually done is to foist upon it several obsolete phonological and grammatical features - the specialities of the Hela Havula - as 'standard' and 'consistent' and thereby to generate unnecessary intricacies with regard to the notions of 'correctness' and 'acceptability'. Although there were a few well-known Sinhalese scholars in this committee, including the Chairman, who were not directly committed to purism, the members of the Hela Havula have been able to override the views expressed by these members and make their creed prevail - the report that appeared consists, in its entirety, of the views expressed by the members of the Hela Havula.

The section on orthography in this report is entirely devoted to emphasizing the advantages and necessity of maintaining the graphic distinction obtaining between s, ś, ṣ; n, ṇ and ḷ, ḻ. As it is

1. See Sammata Siṃhala Vārtava, p. 4.

hardly possible to formulate the exact environment in which these graphemes are differentiated, a host of examples (the majority are from literary works) are given, and it is stressed that residual uncertainties should be elucidated according to the literary usage.¹ This report firmly accents the necessity of maintaining the graphic distinction of n versus ṇ and l versus ḷ and disparages the recent attempts made by some writers to ignore this graphemic redundancy.² It is reasonable to refer to this section - on n,ṇ and l,ḷ - as purely an enumeration of examples, and any underlying factor which operates in deciding the particular environment has not been deduced.

According to this report, the grapheme n occurs in Sinhalese loan words (tatsama) and derivatives (tadbhava) from Sanskrit or Pali corresponding to the original usage, and to illustrate this a few examples are given:³

loan words: adhikarana, apānasāla, upakarana

derivatives: vikunayi (P. vikkinati), viyarana

1. Sammata Siṃhala Vārtāva, p. 49

2. Ibid., pp. 55-56.

3. Ibid., p. 56.

(P. vyākaraṇa) aṅgaṇa (P. angaṇā)

But this is untenable as a common feature; several instances can be cited which violate this rule.

Consider the following:

Skt. <u>karna</u>	>	Sinh. <u>kana</u>	'ear'
<u>nirvāṇa</u>	>	<u>nivana</u>	'the Supreme Goal of
<u>parivena</u>	>	<u>pirivena</u>	'monastery' Buddhism
<u>śravaṇa</u>	>	<u>savana</u>	'ear'
<u>curṇa</u>	>	<u>hunu</u>	'lime'

It is evident that this account on the proper usage of n and ṇ does not give any help to the novice nor to the educated regarding the lessening of the inconsistencies obtaining in their usage, but merely prescribes the practice of maintaining these graphic distinctions because they have occurred so in the classical Sinhalese literary works.

It is in the section on syntax that the majority of the Heḷa specialities are engrafted, and, at the same time, the current usage is disregarded to a large extent. Several obsolete linguistic features resurrected by Kumaratunga and revered by his followers as indisputable ever since, are given in this report under the label 'standard'. For example, the nominative (animate) singular case marker -ē is treated

here as 'regular' and 'normative' whereas such a morpheme to denote the nominative singular sense in current Sinhalese does not exist at all. The examples that can be cited to illustrate the occurrence of this case marker are very limited in number. It appears that the authors were confronted with a difficulty here - only two instances are given; one is from a poetical work of the 12th century and the other from the Sidat Saṅgarāva:¹

Bamara genē niriṇḍu pobayā (Muvadev dā vata)
Maha denē kelesun vānahī (Sidat Saṅgarāva)

How these archaic grammatical features would lead to the riddance of the uncertainties found in the modern written Sinhalese - the primary task of this committee - is difficult to understand.

The other obsolete grammatical features that are prescribed as the standard usages are summarized below:

(1) The vocative case marker -ä

Example: Putä mehi enna (p. 40)

1. Sammata Siṁhala Vārtava, p.19.

This is an idiosyncratic usage of the Hela Havula and is entirely irrelevant to the current usage.

(2) The inanimate indefinite marker -ek (p.21)

As has already been mentioned,¹ in modern Sinhalese the suffix -ek is used exclusively with animate nouns to denote indefiniteness and the suffix -ak occurs with inanimate nouns. The Hela Havula while disregarding the current usage of the category of definiteness in Sinhalese goes far back to the history of literary Sinhalese in search of its 'purer' occurrence and emulates an archaic practice - the suffix -ek for inanimate nouns. It is this peculiar Hela practice that stands as the 'standard' and consonant usage in this report.²

(3) The personal pronouns oba 'you' and ohu 'hē'
(pp. 25-26)

These two pronouns are used in modern literary Sinhalese in the singular sense and their use to denote plurality is adhered to by only the members of the Hela Havula.³

1. See pp. 305-307 above.

2. For details, see pp. 306-307 above.

3. For details, see pp. 309-311 above.

- (4) The reduplication of the indeclinables hā 'and'
and hō 'or' (pp. 33-34)

The conjunctive particles hā and hō occur singly in current Sinhalese, either in written or spoken, whereas this report affirms that these particles should be used always doubly, resurrecting the usage as it was during the period of literary excellence. Some examples are given to illustrate this archaic usage:

Piyā hā putā hā kuṃbura sāti (p. 34)
Hē vayasīn hā nuvaṇin hā vāḍuṇē ya (p. 34)
Gāṇu pān piṇisa vavaṭa hō oyaṭa hō yati (p. 34)

In classical Sinhalese these particles were used twice within a sentence but the rule was not strictly observed as is evidenced by the following examples:

Kasup Budun hā apa Budun aturehi ya
Piyagata hā pādeni deaturehi¹

With the course of time the usage of these particles seems to have been modified, and in current Sinhalese these particles occur only singly. However, soon

1. Dhampiyā atuvā Gātapadaya, ed. Madauyangoda Wimalakitti, p. 72.

after the launching of the linguistic reformatory campaign, Kumaratunga rejected the current usage of these particles - he has not adduced any reason for his refusal - and embraced the outmoded practice.¹ The followers of Kumaratunga dogma still maintain this ancient usage as 'pure' and 'correct' and those Hela members who got into the 'Standard Sinhalese Committee' have been able to maintain their teacher god's view and override the commonly accepted usage.

In this report several verbs which are normal and regularly used in current literary Sinhalese are modified to be in conformity with the precepts of the Hela Havula. Consider the following:

kapā (kapayi in modern usage) (p. 16)

kadā (kaḍayi in modern usage)

talā (taḷayi in modern usage)

natā (naṭayi in modern usage)

damā (daṁayi in modern usage)

This usage is peculiar to the Hela Havula.²

1. See Muvadevdā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 141-142.

2. For details, see pp. 317-318 above: See also Kriyā Vivaraṇaya, pp. 10-15.

The recommendations on word-division in this report may safely be referred to as a brief sketch of the system which was adopted by Kumaratunga and is followed exclusively by his ardent disciples. In devising rules for word-division in Sinhalese, which would eventually have to be conformed to by all official sectors under the government decree, this committee has not scrutinized the majority usage at all; instead the Hela Havula policy which is illustrated in sufficient detail in the work Siṁhalaye Pada Beduma by Arisen Ahubudu and Liyanage Jinadas¹ is advocated. For example, it is prescribed that the ablative, dative and possessive case suffixes (but not -ta) -gen, -hata/and -gē should be written separately from the nouns with which they occur:²

Example: minisā gen (ablative)
 minisā hata (dative)
 minisā gē (possessive)

1. See Siṁhalaye Pada Beduma, pp. 3-35.

2. Sammata Siṁhala Vārtava, p. 32.

Hela Havula advocates this separation due to their reluctance to accept the morphemes -gen, -hata and -gē as case markers. According to the precepts of the Hela Havula, in animate nouns the ablative and possessive sense are expressed with the addition of postpositions or auxiliary forms -gen and -gē, and thereby they conclude that the animate nouns in Sinhalese are inflected only for four cases, i.e., nominative, accusative, dative and vocative.¹ The treating of the morphemes -gen and -gē as postpositions or auxiliary forms but not as case markers rests on no formal criteria except the erroneous view of the Hela Havula regarding the function and occurrence of these forms. If -ta is treated as a case suffix, there is no linguistically valid reason to exclude the suffix -gē from this category; the possessive case is also distinguished morphologically in Sinhalese. In the majority usage the suffix -gē or -gen is never disjoined from its base form in writing, and if they are separated, the inevitable

1. See Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya, pp. 103-105.

result is that they look to most of us very odd.

Consider the following:

Hela Havula usage - normal usage

ballā <u>gē</u>	ballā <u>gē</u>	'dog's'
minisun <u>gē</u>	minisun <u>gē</u>	'men's'
ma <u>gē</u>	ma <u>gē</u>	'mine'
ma <u>gen</u>	ma <u>gen</u>	'from me'

Hela Havula being extremely static in their concept of language and its function do not consider the actual occurrences of features but decompose the linguistic units in order to safeguard their pronouncements. It is this arbitrary system of word-division, which is confined only to this group, that is prescribed to be followed by the entire linguistic community.

'The negative particle no, when it is followed by a finite verb, particle or participle', says this report, 'should be written separately; when it occurs with a noun or derivative noun, it must be joined'¹

1. Suddha kriya padayakata hō krdanta nipātayakata hō
anya vū nipatayakata hō mulin sitinā 'no' nipātaya
ven kotā liviyā yutu yi. Nāmayakata hō krdantayakata
hō mulin sitinā 'no' nipātaya noven vā mā liviyā
yutu yi (Sammata Sinhala Vārtava, p. 33.

This duality of the distribution of no appears to be an added complication to the behaviour of the negative functors in current Sinhalese. In general nowadays such a distinction is not maintained.

The section pirisidu viya yutu vahara 'the usages which need purification' is an attempt to castigate the practices of the current literary usage as 'debased' and 'degenerate' and to legislate the linguistic shibboleths of the Hela Havula as the ideal of perfection. Though several widely used usages of the current literary Sinhalese are labelled as inadmissible in this section, no reason for this point of view has been stated. This section may reasonably be referred to as an exemplification of the specialities of the Hela Havula.

(1) The inanimate plural suffix -val should not be doubled. For example, gevalvala, raṭavalvala, pāra-valvala are erroneous (p. 25).¹

(2) The verbal stems añda-, iñda-, ana-, kapa-, etc. should be employed in the causative form as añdavā,

1. For details, see pp. 301-304 above.

indavā, anvā and kapavā/kapvā. It is evident that most writers inflect these verbs doubly in the causative, giving andavā, indavā, annavā, kappavā etc. This is wrong (p. 25).

This is not a conclusion that has been arrived at by investigating the existing characteristics of the category of causative verb in Sinhalese. The examples that are given here as 'authoritative' cannot be found in current Sinhalese - save for the works of Heḷa Havula - and are reflections of the usages of the pre-fifteenth century literary Sinhalese, more particularly of the 12th and 13th centuries.¹

It is an indisputable fact that in language behaviour certain grammatical elements, with the advent of normal linguistic evolution, tend to become incapable of expressing their original distinctive

1. The sentences given in this report to illustrate the proper usage of the causative verb, I consider, are unacceptable and are to a great extent nonsensical. Consider the following: Guruvarayā lamayā akuru ugannavayi (p. 25); Piyā viyat guruvarayaku yodavā lamayā akuru ugannavayi (p. 25).

characteristics and may derive new counterparts through morphological or syntactic processes. The Hela Havula while failing to recognize the true nature of the behaviour of linguistic phenomena consider the modifications that the Sinhalese language has made after the classical era as 'corruptions' and endeavour to invent a current usage accordingly. The description of causative verbs in this report is largely based on this principle.

It should be noted that the traditional Sinhalese causative verbs like kapvayi, anvayi gradually evolved to look like simple verbs through some phonological processes.

Example:	<u>kapv</u> ayi	kappayi
	<u>anv</u> ayi	annayi
	bas <u>v</u> ayi	bassayi

The causative infix -y- has been assimilated with the phonetic properties of the preceding consonant. Because of the absence of an overt formal characteristic to signify the causative sense of this class of verbs, reinflection of -y- has then taken place as

illustrated below:

(stem) kappa + (finite verb marker) yi

kappa+ <u>va</u> +yi	kappavayi
anna + <u>va</u> +yi	annavayi
bassa+ <u>va</u> +yi	bassavayi

The Hela Havula considers these modifications as corruptions of the uneducated and prescribes the older usage.

(3) The norm given in this report on the naming of books, journals etc. is purely an emulation of a pre-fifteenth century practice. Consequently, the modern usage has been largely ignored. 'When naming books', declares this report, 'the name should be only in neuter nominative case'.¹ This is merely a limitation of the productivity of the linguistic resources one has at one's disposal. The employment of the titles of books, journals etc. in the neuter nominative case is practised exclusively by the Hela Havula as it was during the classical times.

Example: Piyasamara
 Virit Väkiya

1. Sammata Simhala Vārtava, p. 26.

Vavuluva
Kavuduva
Ruppē Andaraya
Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna

The present usage is much more extended, not only so as to be consonant with the new themes that are dealt with in these works but also to take into account extra factors like commercial efficacy etc. - to attract the maximum number of readers possible. Consider the following titles:

Vahallu
Vana Daruvō
Karumakkārayō
Yali Upannemi
Valmatvī Hasarak Nuduṭimi
Pahana Nivvā Kaṭin Piṁbalā

What is paramount for the members of the Heḷa Havula in this connexion is whether the given title can be inflected as an inanimate noun or not. The inclusion of such injunctions, which are primarily based on hypothesis and postulation, clearly indicates the predominance of the few purists in this committee.

(4) The rule on the employment of personal nouns in Sinhalese is also a representation of an older state of usage, which was resurrected by Kumaratunga for his puristic purposes. The use of personal nouns in plural form is praised as 'genuine' in this report and illustrated by the following examples:

Sirijīvayō liyatī (p. 27)

Kirtipālayō kīha (p. 27)

However, the current usage is entirely different from the above instances.

The overwhelming influence of the members of the Hela Havula in this committee is clearly evident by the fact that a special section 'the usage of ä' (ä kāra yeduma), which is regarded by the Hela Havula as the unique feature in Hela language, has been added in place of 'idiom' and 'morphology' which were originally ordered to be investigated by the Minister

of Education. On the usage of ä, however, there is no confusion among the contemporary writers. It is clearly evident that inclusion of this idiosyncratic usage of ä is a triumph of the representatives of the Hela Havula minority over the other members to legislate their ideal.¹

It should be explicitly evident that the contents of this report in no way help to lessen the existing inconsistencies and uncertainties of current literary Sinhalese nor do these pronouncements represent the actual usage of the majority of writers. Conversely, this report disparages the present state of literary Sinhalese as a language which should not be encouraged for emulation without an overall purification. These promulgations can be considered as a determined effort to convert the linguistic ideal of the Hela Havula into the majority usage. Although there were fourteen members in this committee, the predominance of the views of the purists in

1. For details of the use of ä as an absolutely essential phonological and grammatical feature, see pp. 120-121 above.

decision-making is transparent. The outmoded linguistic features of the Heḷa Havula which had already been woven into the Sinhalese School Text Books series assumed absolute authority in this state-backed linguistic codification. The Heḷa Havula, confronted with this unprecedented opportunity, no doubt, would have thought that the diffusion of their creed had been fully accomplished. But soon after the publication of this report their expectations began to fade out.

The report of this committee entitled Sammata Siṃhala Vārtava 'The Standard Sinhalese Report' was published in November 1968. By this time the majority of the books of the Sinhalese School Text Books series had also been brought out, and these texts had already aroused dissatisfaction and resentment among the educated public. As it was the intention of the Minister of Education to enforce in official circles the recommendations of the Standard Sinhalese Committee soon after its publication, the antagonisms were mainly directed towards the Standard Sinhalese Report. The anti-purist campaign against

this report soon gathered momentum and it was declared that Sammata Simhala consists, in its entirety, of nothing but the views expressed by the members of the Hela Havula.¹ The virulent criticisms and antagonisms against these recommendations spread far and wide, involving particularly the universities and other major centres of academic activity.

Strong condemnation of this report was heard from the language departments of the four universities in which there were numbers of trained linguists. Numerous public meetings in major cities like Colombo, Kandy, Galle and Kegalle were held and the national press gave a wide coverage to the controversy. Not only were modern linguists involved in this issue but also the university teachers who were renowned for their erudition in traditional grammar and classical Sinhalese literature rejected this report as misleading and mendacious.² The Sinhalese literary

1. See the articles of J. B. Dissanayake and Nandasena Ratnapala in the Dinamina on 29.1.69.

2. In this connexion M. Sri Rammandala's article (Dinamina, 10.2.1969) and Babarande Sirisivali's article (Dinamina, 5.2.1969) are particularly noteworthy.

societies of the four universities collaborated on this issue and mounted a campaign demanding an immediate disbandment of this committee. While the antagonism of the anti-purists was mounting, the purists on the other hand published only two articles to buttress their ideal contained in this report. However, the ideas expressed by the purists were laments for the past for the most part and were full of nativistic sentiments.¹

Significant in this anti-purist campaign was the inauguration of an organization called 'Sri Laṃkā Viśvavidyālayanhi Siṃhala Piḷibaṇḍa Ācāryavarungē Saṃvidhānaya' (The Confederation of Ceylon University Sinhalese Teachers) to fight against this puristic endeavour. The first meeting was held at the University of Ceylon, Colombo on 22nd February 1969 and it was

1. See the article entitled 'Āmatitumāṭa Mal' (Bunch of Flowers for the Minister) which appeared in the Laṃkāḍīpa on 16.2.1969; see also Gamheva Gunawardhana's article 'Sammata Siṃhala Vādaya' (Standard Sinhalese Controversy) in the Laṃkāḍīpa on 16.2.1969.

unanimously decided to prepare a critique of the Sammata Siṃhala to be forwarded to the Minister. In the report issued by this federation, the Sammata Siṃhala is labelled as a concoction of the precepts of the Heḷa Havula,¹ and it asserts that 'This organization strongly rejects the recommendations of the Standard Sinhalese Committee as they have been based entirely on ideas of a minority whose conception of language and its multifarious functions is erroneous and pernicious. Therefore, it further requests from the Minister of Education that (a) The recommendations in the Standard Sinhalese Report should not be enacted and a fresh committee consisting of the reputable specialists on this field should be appointed (b) As the series of Sinhalese School Text Books also appear to have fallen foul of the dictates of the above

1. See 'Sammata Siṃhala, Sarasavi Ādurangē Vārtava' (Standard Sinhalese, the report of the Ceylon University teachers) which appeared in the Dinamina on 10.4.1969.

minority, the present committee should be dissolved to take immediate effect and a new committee consisting of experts in this domain should be appointed'.¹

Apart from salvoes of criticism at this report from almost all the major centres of academic activity, the Chairman of this committee, Prof. D. E. Hettiaratchi, declared to the press that during the preparation of the final version of the Sammata Siṃhala report an injustice and fraudulent activities had taken place.² This was an added impetus to the growing opposition to the activities of the Standard Sinhalese Committee. These criticisms spread to the House of Representatives, too, and the Minister of Education was urged to present a full report on this question.³ The inevitable result of this outright opposition was

1. See 'Sammata Siṃhala, Sarasavi Ādurangē Vārtava' in Dinamina, 10.4.1969, p. 5.

2. See Dinamina on 18.1.1969, p. 3.

3. The Silumina, 1.4.1969, p. 4.

the Minister's decision to revise the entire report.

Concomitantly, virulent criticisms were also levelled against the series of Sinhalese School Text Books. The confederation of Ceylon University Sinhalese Teachers pointed out that these text books were largely designed to instil the puristic precepts of the Hela Havula into the minds of the younger generation. It further asserts that these texts entirely distort the facts of language and grammar and generate unprecedented confusion concerning the notion of 'correctness' and 'acceptability'.¹

The uproar and indignation against the Standard Sinhalese Report and the Series of Sinhalese School Text Books spread far and wide involving mainly university undergraduates and teaching personnel, and eventually it turned into a direct disapproval of the activities of the Minister of Education whose incessant disparagement of these sectors had already evoked their

1. See the report prepared by this organization (unpublished).

resentment. The following year this wave of commotion was followed by a heated general election campaign in which the energetic involvement of the non-purists particularly against the re-election of the Minister was outstanding. The government was badly defeated at this election and the Education Minister who had held his constituency for many years suffered an irredeemable defeat. How much of this was due to the puristic activities of the Minister and the committee it is hard to assess, but it is certain that the forceful and successful campaign against the re-election of the Minister was supported by the vast majority of anti-purists, including the academic community at large.

Soon after the new government was sworn in, the new Education Minister declared that the Standard Sinhalese Report would be rejected and the series of Sinhalese School Text Books would be withdrawn from use.¹ This was an irreparable damage to the doctrine

1. Dinamina, 9.7.1970, p. 1

the Hela Havula wished to exalt. For those literati whose displeasure and antagonism the Hela Havula had roused arrayed themselves in downright opposition to overwhelm the already sinking hopes of this puristic minority. In any case, the linguistic authoritarianism which these purists endeavoured to introduce, being alien to the habits of the masses, would have prevented the Sinhalese linguistic community at large from supporting it.

CONCLUSION

I have shown in the preceding chapters the characteristics of the puristic linguistic movement headed by Munidasa Kumaratunga in relation to the general trends in puristic and nativistic activity with reference to the Sinhalese language and culture. Unlike nativism in general, purism had undesirable divisive effects which produced among the elite at least two parties with different linguistic credos. Those who followed the majority of the Buddhist hierarchy accepted the classical Sinhalese grammar for literary purposes and encouraged the use of a Sanskritized lexicon in all forms of writing. They felt that Sanskritized embellishments produced desirable ornateness and sonority in writings. The puristic movement of Kumaratunga, originally a breakway from the above mentioned general approach, agreed with the general trend in so far as that the classical

grammar was accepted for all purposes. With regard to the details however there was much debated dissidence.

To make matters worse the purists also over-emphasized the desirability of rectifying the phonological representations and the syntactic pattern of the contemporary literary language which they regarded as in a state of decadence. They went far back in the history of literary Sinhalese in search of a 'purest' and 'best' form of the Sinhalese language and, discarding the Sinhalese historical tradition about the origin of its people as a concoction of the Buddhist monks, went even to a remoter antiquity to establish the origin of the history of the 'Helese' people. These beliefs were much disliked and were seen as chimerical dogmas by the general nationalists whose wider concern was the cultural renaissance and 'nation-building'.

Kumaratunga was keen to establish a small and exclusive elitist circle confined to a small group by which the younger aspirants may be controlled and

dominated. This alienated itself from the general revivalist activity on one hand, the ordinary speakers of the language on the other. Like all linguistic purists anywhere in the world they went on to castigate the language used by the masses of the people as 'incorrect' and 'vulgar'. Their fanaticism to change such widely accepted and normal colloquial utterances as mama yanawa 'I/am go/ing' to mā yanawa is a case in point.

While the general nationalistic endeavours were converging together for overall resuscitation of what was deemed to be the lost Sinhalese heritage, the purists headed by Kumaratunga thus played a role which was divisive and critical of the work done by all other such circles. Kumaratunga's doctrine of linguistic perfection, though it sprang up as a direct result of the then growing revivalist and nationalistic activities, being contrary to the linguistic habits of the Sinhalese community at large remained incapable

of infusing the nationalistic sentiments and aspiration of political freedom into the hearts of the people.

It is true that the Hela fraternity gained a fair following among the pedagogic circles who knew no other language than Sinhalese, and who felt the sense of insecurity and inferiority the most as a result of foreign linguistic domination. It was in the midst of a socio-economic milieu wherein education in Sinhalese brought meagre economic rewards that the Hela Havula endeavoured to propagate their 'Helese' creed. But the factors operating against this movement were many. Their works were not only written in a language without savour or sap but contained for the most part awkward expressions of their own coinage which were avowedly opposed to the majority usage. The Hela movement was equally critical of the socially acclaimed national elite and of the hierarchy of the Buddhist church. The effects of isolationism began to show themselves fairly early, but more definitely soon after Kumaratunga's death. When placed

in the main stream of socio-cultural forces of the contemporary society, Kumaratunga and his small circle of ardent followers were eccentric loners. Their desire to withdraw themselves from the people stood as a serious obstacle to the diffusion of their 'Helese' doctrine.

Moreover, in spite of the exalted status of Sinhalese suggested by Kumaratunga's theories, the identification of language development with classicization leading to the adoption of a medium which no doubt appeared difficult and extraordinary would have prevented the masses from supporting it when they were being stimulated into a growing democratic egalitarian ideology. A movement which might otherwise have been able to make a considerable impact on the social ethos and have played a primary role in the revival of Sinhalese Buddhist independence turned out, owing to its bigoted and parochial character, to be a bitter struggle confined to the members of Kumaratunga's own caste for the most part.

The significance of the triumvirate consisting of the Buddhist clergy, the practitioners of

indigenous medicine and the Sinhalese school teachers in the nationalist struggle has been adequately discussed in G. C. Mendis (1957), Robert N. Kearney (1967) and M. W. Sugathapala De Silva (1974). The contribution of these three groups in the general nationalist movement and the shaping of a government whose political philosophy is committed to Sinhalization has been dealt with in these three works. It is noteworthy, however, that the role of the purists has always been negligible in this respect. Despite this parochial character of the Hela movement there is however a significant desire among modern writers to follow the general principles of the classical grammar in their writings in order primarily not to be the subject of ridicule at the annual commemorative meetings of Kumaratunga's death which are convened by his devoted disciples. To this extent at least it can be said that purism has contributed to the sustenance of diglossia in Sinhalese.

APPENDIX I

SOME EXAMPLES OF THE ALTERATIONS MADE IN

THE EDITIONS OF SINHALESE CLASSICS

BY THE HEĻA HAVULA*

- (1) Apa mahā Gautama Budu rajānanvahansē pera karuṇā
 puraṣsara prajñā gati āti Sumedha nam maha tavusak
 vā, Divakuru Budun hamu vā hastagata vū nivan sāpat
 hārā, mululovaṭa hita piṇisa budu bava patā labana
 lada vivaraṇa āti vā, buddha kāraka dharmayan purana
 abhiprāyayen sasara vadā, mātā bhāgayehi du upanupan
 budun no varadavā dakā vivaraṇa sri ladin, sārā-
 saṅkha kalpa lakṣayak mulullehi niraturu vā vaḍanā
 lada ēkākāra vīrya āti vā, daśaparakā pāramī dharma-
 yan muhukuruva, Tusi pura pāminā . . .

(Nikāya Saṁgrahaya, ed. Kumaratunga, Colombo:
 Ratnakara Press, 1922, p. 1).

Cf.

Apa mahā Gautama Budurajānanvahanse pera karuṇā-
 purassara prajñā gati āti Sumedha nam mahatavusakva
 Divakuru Budun hamuva hastagatavū nivansampat hāra
 muḷu tunlovaṭa hita piṇisa budubav patā labanalada
 vivaraṇa ātiva buddhakārakadharmayan purana abhiprāyen

*Alterations are underlined.

sasara vāda māta bhāgayehidu upanupan budun novaradavā
dāka vivaraṇa sri ladin sāra asaṅkhyā kalpa lakṣayak
mulullehi niraturuva vadanālada ekākāra vīrya ātiva
dasa prakāra paramīdharmayan muhukuruvā Tusi pura
pāmīna . . .

(Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, eds. Simon De Silva, A. M.
Gunasekara and W. F. Gunawardhana, Colombo: Govt.
Printer, 1907, p. 1).

- (2) Etana paṭangenā devīhi rantatiyekā bat evā hiṅga
tabā genā vadati. Raja ē valandā yāpeyi. Hē 'mapiyanō
kisē yāpeti'yi pilivisā epavat asā 'Āya hiṅgin yam
kisi dāyak nogenā vādā denneyā'yi yediyā. Etāna
paṭan genā devīhi bat muhulā tabā genā vadati. Eyidu
asā 'anniya kehe bānda novādā denneyā'yi yediyā.
Etāna paṭan genā ranmaravaḍiya bat evā piyālā payin
genā vadati. Raja ē asā 'anniya maravaḍi lā novādā
denneyā'yi yediyā. Etāna paṭan genā devīhi gaṇḍa
diyen nahā sarirayehi siyu miyuru galvā pilī peravā
genā vadati. Rajapā ovun sirira levā yāpeti. Valīdu
pilivisā epavat asā 'anniya novādā denneyā'yi vālākī.
Devīhi doraṭu gē mulā siṭā 'Himi, Bimsara maharaja;
uhu ladaru kalā marā nopiyā dunva; topa saturā tepimā
puṭva; mē topagē nimām dākmāyā; mam metana paṭan
genā topa daknā nolābemi; magē varadek ātnam mā
kerehi kṣamā karanneyyā'yi vālāpā vāhāsā nāvāttā.

(Amāvatura, ed. Kumaratunga, Colombo: Vidyasagara
Press, 1922, chapter vi (Rajadamana), p. 15).

Cf.

Etana patan gena devīhi rantāṭiyekā bat evā hiṅga
tabāgena vadati. Raja ē valanda yāpeyi. Hē 'Mabapanō
kise yapetī' pilivisa epavat asā 'Āya hiṅgin yam

dāyak nogena vadda denneya'yi yediya. Etān paṭan
 gena devīhi bat muhulā tabāgena vaditi. Eyidu
 asā 'Anniya kehe baṇḍā novadda dennēya'yi yediya.
 Etāna paṭangena ranmaravadiyā bat evā piyālā payin
 gena vaditi. Raja e asā 'Anniya maravadi lā novādda
 dennēya'yi yediya. Etana paṭangena dēvīhi gaṇḍa
 diyen nahā śarīrayehi siyumiyuru galvā piḷī perava-
 gena vaditi. Rajapā ovun siriru levā yapeti.
 Vāḷidu piḷivisa epavat asā 'Anniya novādda dennēya'yi
 vāḷakī. Dēvīhi doraṭugē mula siṭṭā 'Himi, Bimsara
 Maharaja; ohu ladaru kalā marā nopiva dunva. Topa
 saturā topima puṭuva. Mē topagē nimām dākmaya.
 Mam metan paṭan gena topa daknā nolābemi. Magē
 varadak ātnam mā kerehi kṣamā karannēya'yi valāpa
 vahāsa nāvatta.

(Amāvatura, ed. Walivitiye Sorata, Colombo: Anula
 Press, 1960, p. 76).

- (3) Samanoḷa muhula maha samudura mevul ba ra
 Sulakala puvala Lakaṅgana siri yovun va ra
 Tarakala visal vāsai yaturu menuva ra
 Baṇḍāhala ruvan tana paṭa kiyeliyā pavu ra (v.9)
- Unu no vā barāṇa sivusāṭa voṭunut pālā ṇḍā
 Veṇu men pasak un saṇḍā sī hasun ma ṇḍā
 Manuraja kulen pāvatena piḷivela nosi ṇḍā
 Ganu avasara e niriṇḍu siri patul va ṇḍā (v.19)
- Sirisara hiṅgul vilā sē hasa vālev e na
 Suravara salela rata lavanatā daḷa dula na
 Manahara saṇḍa vala pelā kelavarā pene na
 Pahasara la saṇḍa yuvalēk ātnam eme na (v.83)

(Salalihini Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga, 1925).

Cf.

Samanola muhula maha samudura mevul ba ra
 Sulakala puvala Lakaṅgana siri yovun va ra
 Tarakala visal vāsai yaturu menuva ra
 Baṇḍahala ruvan tanapaṭa kiyaliya pavu ra (v.9)

Unu nova baraṇa sivusāṭa votunut pāla ṇda
 Veṇumen pasak unsaṇda sīhasun mā da
 Manuraja kulen pāvatena piḷivela nosi ṇda
 Ganu avasara enaraniṇdu siripatul vā ṇda (v.19)

Sirisara hingul vila sē hasa välev e na
 Suravara saleḷa rata lavanata dala dula na
 Manahara saṇda valāpela keḷavara pene na
 Pāhāsara lasaṇda yuvalak ātnam eme na (v.83)

(Salalihini sandesaya, ed. Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama,
 Colombo: Lankabhinava Visruta Press, 1938).

(4) Tun kalhi mā pāvā ti
 Padarut siyal lovā ä ti
 Ätāmbula se dāna ga ti
 Eyin Sammā Sambudunā ye ti (v. 263)

Sihilal pavanin gim maṇḍavāli yā
 Mesiyal lovā piya bas doḍavāli yā
 Viyavul sata sitā tos vaḍavāli yā
 Ganabol bima mahaṇḍin haṇḍavāli yā (v.309)

Muhudā da pup rat paṇḍera gāvasvi yā
 Nubatala pipi mal viyanin vāsvi yā
 Mulu lovā suvaṇḍāti mal vāsi vāsvi yā
 Satara apā sata suvase vāsvi yā (v. 310)

Kesarun genā ārā dun niya paṇduri n
 Gijiṇḍun sanahā lū rasa goduri n
 Gijiṇḍun genā vatkaḷa kara pokuri n
 Kesarun gim durā lū diya dahari n (v. 324)
 (Budu Guṇa Alaṁkāraya, ed. Kumaratunga, 1929)

Cf.

Tun kalhima pāvā ti
 Padarut siyal lova a ti
 Atāmbula se dāna ga ti
 Eyin Sammā Sambuduna ye ti (v.263)

Sihilāl pavanin gim maḍavāli ya
 Mesiyal lova piyabas doḍavāli ya
 Viyavul sata sita tos vaḍavāli ya
 Ganabol bima mahaṇḍin haṇḍavāli ya (v.309)

Muhudada pipi ras paṇḍerin vāsvi ya
 Nubatala pipi mal viyanin vāsvi ya
 Muḷulova suvaṇḍāti malvāsi vāsvi ya
 Satara apā sata suvasē vāsvi ya (v.310)

Kesarun gena hāra dun niya paṇdure n
 Gijiṇḍun sanahālū rasa godure n
 Gijiṇḍun gena vatkaḷa kara pokure n
 Kesarun gim duralu diya dahare n (v.324)
 (Budugūṇa Alaṁkāraya, ed. D. B. Jayatilaka,
 Colombo, 1953)

- (5) Vipul kulūṇu met guṇayen lev pus na
 Kopul ata daḷasa lesa teda rās is na
 Tepul genā suriṇḍu raknā lev sas na
 Upulvan deviṇḍu dakā dev mē has na (v.5)

Ati dorā dorā rat iñdu nil miñi tora na
 Pätirā añduru harā kārā pālāmbeta kira na
 Niti rayā sarana vē mādā suraṅgana hara na
 Vetī mehi bisaru digāsiyo saha tuṭu ura na (v.15)

Dāmbadeṇi Alaka purā visu dinisuru vila sa
 Loba vata me raḷu vetā Sarasavi siri nivesa
 Taṃba ranā pivisā viyovaga vaduva sihila sa
 Baṃba Diyabaṇḍa dedena vindinō veda vehe sa (v.37)

(Parevi Sandēśa Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga, 1932).

Cf.

Vipul kuluṇu met guṇayen lev pus na
 Kopul ata daḷasa lesa teda rāsa is na
 Tepul geṇa Suriñdu raknā lev sas na
 Upulvan deviñdu dāka dev mē has na (v.4)

Āti dora dora iñdunil miñi ran tora na
 Pätira añduru kārā hara pālāmbeta kira na
 Niti rāya sarana vē māda suraṅgana harana
 Vetī mehi bisaru digāsiyo tuṭu saha uraṇa (v.13)

Dāmbadeṇi Alaka pura visu dinisuru vila sa
 Lobavata meraja veta Sarasavi siri nive sa
 Taṃbarana pivisa viyovaga vanuva sihila sa
 Baṃba Diyabaṇḍa dedena viñdinō vada vehe sa (v.37)

(Parevi Sandēśaya, ed. Kahave Sri Ratanasara,
 Colombo: Vidyarthi Press, 1932).

- (6) Sāvāt nuvarā Anēpiñḍu maha sitāṇan gē gehidī dāvas
 patā saṅga de dāsek vaḷandanasēkā. Esē mā Visākhā-
 van gē gehi dīd saṅga de dāsek mā vaḷandanasēkā.
 Sāvāt nuvarā yam yam kenek, rajjuruvaṇ dakvād,

danak det nam mun dennā gen avasarayak ladin mut
 anek lesekin dan vuvada dī liyā noheti. Īṭa
 kārāṇa kimda yat:- pōman nāttekin noveyi. 'Topa
 dan dena tenaṭa Anēpiṇḍu maha siṭāṇō hō Viśākhāvō
 hō avudā'yi vicārā, 'nātā'yi kī kalhi lakṣa gaṇan
 viyadam koṭā dun danak vuvad, luṇu nō lā dumā pū
 māluvak men, ē danak koṭā nokiyati. Ū dennā
 vahandā gē ruciya abhiprāya iṇdurā daniti. Un gē
 vidhānayan idi kaḷa dan vahandā suva sē vaḷāṇdana
 sēkā.

(Saddharma Ratnāvaliya, ed. Kumaratunga, 1932,
 'Samandevī Vastuva', p. 1).

Cf.

Sāvāt nuvara Anēpiṇḍumahasiṭāṇangē geyidī dasas
 patā saṅga dedāsek vaḷāṇdanasēka. Esēma Viśākhā-
 vangē gehidīṭ saṅga dedāsekma vaḷāṇdanasēka.
 Sāvāt nuvara yam yam kenek rajjuruvaṇa dakvāt danak
 detnam mun dennāgen avasarayak ladin mut anik lesakin
 dan vuvat dīliya noheti. Īṭa kārāṇa kimda yat:-
 pōman nāttekin noveyi. 'Topa dan dena tenaṭa Anē-
 piṇḍumahasiṭāṇō hō Viśākhāvō hō avudā'yi vicārā
 nātāyi kī kalhi lakṣa gaṇan viyadam koṭa dun danak
 vuvat luṇu nolā duvāpū māluvak men ē danak koṭa
 nokiyati. Ū dennā vahandāgē ruciya abhiprāya
 iṇdurā daniti. Ungē vidhānayan idikala dan vahandā
 suvasē vaḷāṇdanasēka.

(Saddharmaratnāvaliya, ed. D. B. Jayatilaka,
 Colombo: Svadesa Mitraya Press, 1930, 'Samandevī
 Vastuva', p. 163).

(7) Subaṇḍa siyal sivu vē dānā pivituru vā
 Pālāṇḍa kasun hū abaraṇa visituru vā
 Nomaṇḍa perevi bamuṇaṇ siṭṭā niraturu vā
 Esaṇḍa kiyana jaya tuti nada anaturu vā (v.43)

Kaṇālā upulmal gavasā kesvati ya
 Biṇḍālā pokurukuru kārā mutu hara saṭi ya
 Bāṇḍālā gavan vetā gava palu liya siṭi ya
 Nobala mitura yāgan maṅgā potu piṭi ya (v.75)

Vaṭina noyek baṇḍu āra genā āma dā ma
 Vaṭina milaṭa novikuṭṭā koṭṭā veleṇḍā ma
 Siṭina liyan dakā sihi kārā baṇa dā ma
 Vaḍina kōm gasā sevaṇē norāṇḍā ma (v.60)

(Girā Sandēśa Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga,
 Colombo: Apa Press, 1933).

Cf.

Subaṇḍa siyal sivu vē dāna pivituru va
 Pālāṇḍa kasunhū abaraṇa visituru va
 Nomaṇḍa perevi bamuṇaṇ siṭa niraturu va
 Esaṇḍa kiyana jayatutinada anaturu va (v.43)

Kaṇālā upul mal gavasā kesvāṭi ya
 Biṇḍālā pokuru kuru kārā mutuhara sāṭi ya
 Bāṇḍālā gavan veta gavapalu liya siṭi ya
 Tobalā mitura yā gan maṅga potu piṭi ya (v.75)

Vaṭina noyek baṇḍu ārāgena hāmadā ma
 Vaṭina milaṭa novikoṭa koṭa veleṇḍā ma
 Siṭina liyan dāka sihikara baṇa dā ma
 Vaḍina kon gasa sevaṇē noranda ma (v.60)

(Girā Sandēśaya, ed. Makuluduve Piyaṛatana,
 Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1948)

(8) Liyā lakala pabalu yā tām pelā maha la
 Soyā patara pala bitu piriyaaminudu la
 Ayā nayana dākā dākā siri noyana ka la
 Kiyā pahayā siri aṅgavanu kelesa ba la (v.11)

Gahan viyatā viyāketa siṭi siṭi tāni nī
 Vahan karata mal muvaraṇḍa sal hisi nī
 Pahan saṇdehi riṭi kan udayaga udi nī
 Pahan saṇḍin vaḍu Ambuluvā kaḍi nī (v.25)

Vata neta kamalupula sari vi kivi vada na
 Boruyā yi kiyati me uvam no dākā eka tā na
 Diya keḷanavun dākā pokuṇē pul mali na
 Kivi basā sābava nuṃbaṭa mā penenu yā etāna (v.88)
 (Mayūra Sandēśa Vivaranaya, ed. Kumaratunga,
 Colombo, 1935).

Cf.

Liyā pabalu sulakala tam pelā maha la
 Soyā satara palabitu piriyaaminudu la
 Ayā nayana dāka dāka risi noyana ka la
 Kiyā pahaya siri aṅgavanu kelesa ba la (v.11)

Gahan viyata viyaketa siṭi siṭi tāni nī
 Vahan karata mal muvarada salhisi nī
 Pahan saṇdehi mepuren vāḍa adahasi nī
 Pahan saṇḍin vaḍu Ambuluvākaḍi nī (v.25)

Vataneta kamalupula sarivī kivivada na
 Boruyayi kiyati meuvam nodāka ekatā na
 Diya keḷanavun dāka pokuṇē pulmali na
 Kivibasa sābava nuṃbaṭama penenuya etā na (v.88)

(Mayura Sandēśa Varṇanāva, ed. Veragoda Amaramoli,
 Colombo: J. D. Fernando, 1934).

- (9) Giya davasä Miyulu nuvarä Ängāti nam rajek viyā.
 Ohu gē Rujā nam priya vū duvak āta. Ō tomō manojña
 vū rū ätti yā; sūksama vū nuvaṇa ätti yā; acala vū
 śraddhā ätti yā; tudus jātiyak daknā jāti smarāṇa
 jñāna ätti yā. Ē raja dvaspatā pasvisi karaṇḍuvak
 suvaṇdamal hā suvaṇda palaṇdanā hā ē duvaṭa deyi;
 mādi pohoyen mādi pohoyāṭa dan denu saṇdahā dahasin
 baṇda piyali da deyi . . .

(Pūjāvalī, ed. Kumaratunga, 1935, 'Ruja Vastuva',
 p. 10).

Cf.

Yaṭa giya dvasa Miyulu nuvara Ängāti nam rajek
 viya. Ohugē Rujā namvu priyavū duvak āta. Ō
 manojñavū rū ättiya. Sūksamavū nuvaṇa ättiya.
 Acalavū śraddhā ättiya. Tudus jātiyak daknā jātis-
 marāṇa jñāna ättiya. Ē raja dvas patā pasvisi
 karaṇḍuvak suvaṇda mal hā suvaṇda palaṇdanā duvaṭa
 deyi. Mādi pohoyen pohoyāṭa dan denu saṇdahā
 dahasin baṇda piyalida deyi . . .

(Pūjāvalī, ed. Kirialle Nanavimala, Colombo: M. D.
 Gunasena & Co., 1965, p. 236).

- (10) Genā vidu kaga patev - ganaraja'rakata muni hata
Sādī dunukē kākulu - kirulu balā vāla harin (v.66)
Vājāmbā tame'ka baṇda - kārā diya siyal rivi raja
Neteda kele meda vānāsī - piyum siyanudu ganaraja (v.68)
Muniṇdu pudāṭa gata - kānahil mal semera ev
Mihikata navasadala nil - diyuli'ṇdu govuvāla mevul (v.73)

Vimal kārā silil - kaḷa muniñdu taru nāṅgamen
Satnata gilān'yukal - pat diva osu sarā kal (v.82)
 (Sasadā Vivaraṇaya, ed. Kumaratunga, 1939).

Cf.

Dunukē kākūḷu kiruḷu - sādī balāvāla harin
 Geṇa gaṇaraja vidukaga - arakāṭa patave munihaṭa (v.66)
 Vājāmbi gaṇaraja karā - tama ekabañdu diya siyal
 Riviraja neteda keḷemedā - piyum siyanudu vānasī (v.68)
 Nava sadala nil diyul - ratiñdugovu vāramevul
 Mihikata muniñdu pudev gata - kāṇahillamal semarev (v.73)
 Vimal karā silil - kaḷa muniñdu taru nāgimen
 Ayukal gilān sathāṭa - divaosu sarā kal pat (v.82)
 (Sasadāvata, ed. Aturuvalle Dhammapala, Colombo:
 Vidya Prabodha Press, 1934).

(11) Hamala komala pavan - hādā kovul sara nan liya
Gum pirimāñdā mañda lōla - kisala pela muvarañdā rāñdā
 (canto 6, v.2)

Monara mulu laganā - turehi veleḷ pashi tuñḍu
Pirimāñdā pavana'mbala pili - bara idu kārā kekā gat
 (canto 6, v. 3)

Rivikalhu yata vil - kal hala hasavāla mevul
Vana sovuni gugurāmen - piyum daṅga biṅgu rāvnen
 (canto 6, v.4)

Ekak nāmī pul - lāhābekhi ata lā mada
Diya sun sāvu siri dārū - biṅgu vālanu'du nāṅgeta bā
 (canto 10, v.26)

(Kavsilumina, ed. Kumaratunga, 1944)

Cf.

Nanliyagum mada - pirimädä lela kisalpeḷa
Muvaraṇḍa räṇḍi kovulsara - ädä hamale komala pavan
(canto 6, v.2)

Pirimädä tuḍu veḷa - paṣhi lagnā monara mulu
Pavaninaṁbala pilbara - kārä iṇḍu kekarāv gat
(canto 6, v.3)

Rivikalhu yata vil - hasavāla haḷa mevuldam
Piyum daṅga biṅgu räṁnen - vana sovini gugurāmen
(canto 6, v.4)

Ekak nāmī pul - lähābekhī ata lā
Biṅguvālanuḍu nägeta - bā mada diyasun säv siri dāru
canto 10, v. 26)

(Kavsilumina, ed. Madugalle Siddhattha, Colombo:
Govt. Printer, 1926).

(12) Samanoḷa mudunā siripada obana maṅgula ṭa
Nikasala maha saṅgana genā vaḍina muniṇḍuṭa
Pāhadula sunil māṇikin kaḷa maṅga lesa ṭa
Manadoḷa pireyi gaṅgā sirisara duṭa topa ṭa (v.78)

Minisek diyā pīnā yeyi e tera ṭa
Aṅganak diyā pīnā eyi me tera ṭa
Paharak duna saranin ohu sirasa ṭa
Anekak āṇḍuvā e saṇdehi durā si ṭa (v.84)

(Haṁsa Sandēśaya, in Vīdāgama Maitraya Himiyangē
Prabandha, ed. R. Tennakon, Colombo: M. D.
Gunasena, 1958).

Cf.

Samanoḷa muduna siripada obana maṅgula ṭa
Nikasala mahasaṅgana gena vaḍina muniṇḍu ṭa
Pāhādula sunil māṇiken kaḷa maṅga lesa ṭa
Manadoḷa pireyi gaṅgasirisara duṭu topa ṭa (v.78)

Minisek diya pīnāyeyi etara ṭa
 Aṅganak diya pīnāeyi metera ṭa
 Paharak duna saranin ohu sirasa ṭa
 Anikak āṇḍuvā esaṇḍehi dura si ṭa (v.84)

(Haṃsa Sandēśaya, ed. C. E. Godakumbura, Colombo:
 Apothecaries Co. Ltd., 1953).

(13) Unu novā barāṇa sivu sāṭa voṭunut pāla ṇda
 Venu men pasak un saṇḍā sīhasun mā da
 Manuraja kulen pāvātena piḷivela nosi ṇda
 Ganu avasara eniriṇḍu siri patul vā ṇda (v.19)
 Sirisara hiṅgul vilā sē hasa vālev e na
 Suravara saleḷa rata lavanatā daḷa dula na
 Manahara saṇḍā valā peḷa keḷavarā pene na
 Pahasara ḷa saṇḍa yuvalek ātnam eme na (v.83)

(Salalihini Sandēśaya, ed. R. Tennakon, Colombo,
 M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1956).

Cf.

Unu nova barāṇa sivu sāṭa voṭunut pāla ṇda
 Venu men pasak un saṇḍa sīhasun mā da
 Manuraja kulen pāvātena piḷivela nosi ṇda
 Ganu avasara enaraniṇḍu siripatul vā ṇda (v.19)
 Sirisara hiṅgul vila sē hasa vālev e na
 Suravara saleḷa rata lavanata daḷa dula na
 Manahara saṇḍa valā peḷa keḷavara pene na
 Pāhāsara ḷasaṇḍa yuvalek ātnam eme na (v.83)

(Sālahihini Sandēśaya, ed. Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama,
 Colombo: Lankabhinava Visruta Press, 1938).

- (14) Subaṇḍa siyal sivu vē dānā pivituru vā
 Pālāṇḍa kasun hū abaraṇa visituru vā
 Nomaṇḍa perevi bamuṇan siṭa niraturu vā
 Esaṇḍa kiyana jaya tuti nada anaturu vā (v.43)

Kanālā upul mal gavasā kes vāṭi ya
 Biṇḍālā pokuru 'kuru karā mutu hara sāṭi ya
 Bāṇḍālā gavan vetā gava palu liya siṭi ya
 Tobalā mitura yāgan maṅga Potu piṭi ya (v.75)

(Girā Sandēśaya, ed. R. Tennakon, Colombo: Sri Lanka Prakasaka Samagama, 1948).

Cf.

Subaṇḍa siyal sivuvē dāna pivituru va
 Pālāṇḍa kasunhū abaraṇa visituru va
 Nomaṇḍa perevi bamuṇan siṭa niraturu va
 Esaṇḍa kiyana jayatutinada anaturu va (v.43)

Kanalā upul mal gavasā kesvāṭi ya
 Biṇḍālā pokuru kuru kāra mutuhara sāṭi ya
 Bāṇḍālā gavan veta gavapalu liya siti ya
 Tobalā mitura yā gan maṅga Potupiṭi ya (v.75)

(Girā Sandēśaya, Makuluduve Piyaratana, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1948).

- (15) Lakisuru suratā leḷa kaga pata vala ku lē
 Niraturu nāṅgeta evigasā pāḷa digin ve lē
 Amituru nirinḍu aṅganan komāḷa ura ta lē
 Piyovuru tisara mutuhara neḷumbu dāḷi ha lē (v.94)

Dakā hima selā āt siharada uturu da sa
 Ehi sidaṅgana vena vena gāta mē le sa
 Pārakum rajuṭa sari nirinḍek tilōku sa
 Ohu ruva māyi piḷibiṁbu pat dapaṇa pa sa (v.95)

Kiya ga māṅgiya, enu kōhi siṭā, dada samanōḷa gosinā
 Noya kiya 'mutu edigā bamuṇu Sumana suriṇḍu visi nā
 Giya kalā dedahas pansiya rajaku etiyi diya nā
 Kiyaviṇa tanvāsiya enam Parākum raja medi nā
 (Pārākumbā Sirit Peheliya, (v.116)
 ed. Amarasiri Gunawardhana, Colombo:
 K. A. Ariyadasa, 1953).

Cf.

Lakisuru surata leḷa kaga paṭa valā ku ḷa
 Nilaturu nāgeṇa evigasa pala digin ve ḷa
 Amituru niriṇḍu aṅanan komala ura ta ḷa
 Piyayuru tisara mutuhara nelambu dāli ha ḷa (v.90)

Daka hima sel āti siha dada uturu de sa
 Ehi iṇḍagana vena vena gāta mē le sa
 Pārakum rajuta sari niriṇdek tilōku sa
 Ohu ruvamaya piḷibiṁbu pat dapaṇa pa sa (v.91)

Kiyaga magiya enu koyi siṭa dada samanala gosi nā
 Kimeka amutu ediga bamuṇu Sumaṇa suriṇḍu visi nā
 Giya kala dedahas pansiya rajek eteyi diya nā
 Kiyamina gam vasiya enam Parakum raja medi nā
 (Pārakumba Sirita, ed. D. S. S. (v.112)
 Gunawardhana, Colombo: Sevyasri
 Press, 1908).

- (16) Vipul kulunū met guṇayen lev pus na
 Kopul atā daḷasa lesa teda raṣ is na
 Tepul geṇā Suriṇḍu rakinā lev sas na
 Upulvan Suriṇḍu dakā devā mē has na (v.5)

Äti dorä dorä iñdunil miñi ran tora ña
 Pätirä añduru kara harä palämbeta kira ña
 Niti rayä sarana vē mädä suraṅgana hara ña
 Vetī mehi bisaru digäsiyo saha tuṭu ura ña (v.13)
 (Parevi Sañdes Pahadanaya, ed. Alavuisi Sabihela,
 Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1967)

Cf.

Vipul kulupu met guṇayen lev pus na
 Kopul ata daḷasa lesa teda rasa is na
 Tepul gena Suriñdu raknā lev sas na
 Upulvan deviñdu dāka dev mē has na (v.4)

Äti dora dora iñdunil miñi ran tora ña
 Pätira añduru kara hara pälaṃbeta kira ña
 Nitiräya sarana vē mäda suraṅgana hara ña
 Vetī mehi bisaru digäsiyo tuṭu saha ura ña (v.13)
 (Paravi Sandēśaya, ed. Kahave Sri Sumangala
 Ratanasara, Colombo: Vidyārtha Press, 1932).

APPENDIX II

THE EDITIONS OF THE SIDAT SAṅGARĀVA
AND THE SINHALESE GRAMMARS
WRITTEN UP TO 1935

(a) Editions of the Sidat Saṅgarāva

- James De Alwis, Sidat Saṅgarāva (Translated into English with an introduction), Colombo: The Govt. Printer, 1852.
- Pundit Tudawe Gunawardhana, Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo: Wesleyan Press, 1865.
- Pundit Batuwantudawe, Purāṇa Sannaya Sahita Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo: Lankabhinava Visruta Press, 1882.
- Hikkaduwe Sumangala, Sanna Sahita Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo: Vidyasagara Press, 1884.
- C. T. Perera, Sidat Saṅgarā Praśnottara, Colombo: Sucaritodaya Press, 1901.
- Ratmalane Sri Dharmarama, Sidat Saṅgarā Vistara Sannaya, Kalaniya: Satya Samuccaya Press, 1902.
- Sri Sumedhatissa and C. E. C. Gunatilake, Siddhānta Praśnottara, Colombo, 1902.
- J. B. Ranasinghe, Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo, 1916.
- Prajnasena Ediriweera, Sidat Saṅgarā Vinisa, Colombo, 1924.
- W. F. Gunawardhana, Siddhānta Pariksanaya, Colombo: N. J. Cooray & Sons, 1924.

- J. P. Samarasingha, Vistara Vyākhyā Sahita Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo, 1927.
- K. S. Ratanasara, Sidat Saṅgarā Bhāva Sannaya, Colombo: Mahabodhi Press, 1929.
- Munidasa Kumaratunga, Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya, Colombo: Vidyasagara Press, 1934.
- R. Tennakon, Patiraja Piruvan Himigē Sidat Saṅgarāva, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1954.

(b) Sinhalese Grammars written up to the emergence of the puristic grammatical works of the Hela Havula

- Joannes Ruell, Grammatica of Singaleesche taalkunst, zynde een korte methode om de voornaamste Fondamenten van de Singaleesche spraak te leeren, Amsterdam: Francois Halma, 1708.
- James Chater, A Grammar of the Cingalese Language, Colombo: Nicholas Bergman (Govt. Press), 1815.
- Samuel Lambrick, A Grammar of the Singhalese Language as it is now written and spoken by men of learning and others, Colombo: Cotta Church Mission Press, 1834.
- James De Alwis, An Introduction to Singhalese Grammar, designed for the use of European Students, Colombo: Govt. Press, 1859.
- Hikkaduwe Sumangala, Varna Nīti saha Siṁhala Vyākaranaya, Colombo: Lakrivi Kirana Press, 1878.
- Cornelis Alwis, The Sinhalese Handbook, Colombo: Govt. Printer, 1880.
- S. Coles, Sinhalese Grammar, Colombo: Govt. Printer, 1881.
- C. Chounavel, A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo: Catholic Orphanage Press, 1886.

- Weragama Puncibandara, Pada Nītiya, Colombo: The Buddhist Press, 1888.
- A. M. Gunasekara, A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo: G. T. A. Skeen (Govt. Printer), 1891.
- Simon De Silva, Sinhalese English Grammar, Colombo: Govt. Printer, 1897.
- H. Jayakody, Vyākaraṇa Mañjarī, Colombo: Vidyasagara Press, 1900.
- John Block, Siṃhala Vākya Nītiya, Panadura: Sucaritodaya Press, 1903.
- D. Gabriel, Vākya Vinyāsaya, Colombo, 1904.
- Simon De Silva (The Gate Mudaliyar), Śabdānuśāsanaya or The Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo: Govt. Press, 1907.
- D. E. Johannes, Siṃhala Vyākaraṇaya, Colombo, 1916.
- T. Karunaratna, Siṃhala Dhātu Ratnāvalī, Colombo, 1920.
- _____, Siṃhala Sandhi Ratnāvaliya, Colombo, 1924.
- D. M. Samarasingha, Kāraka Mañjarī, Colombo: Mahajana Press, 1925.
- Vatane Dhammananda, Heḷa Dā Ruvanakara, Panadura, 1929.
- N. Ratanasara, Vesesun Veses Vinisa, Kalaniya: Vidyālankara Press, 1930.
- K. Silaratana, Śabda Parīksā, Colombo, 1931.

S. P. Obert, Vyākaraṇa Vidyāva, Maggona, 1931.

Theodore G. Perera, Siṃhala Bhāsava, Colombo, 1932.

Hissalle Siri Sumangala, Siṃhala Vyākaraṇa Parik-
ṣaṇaya, Veyangoda Press,
Veyangoda, 1937.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) The works of the Hela Havula

- Ahubudu, Arisen. - Kumaratuṅgu Āsura.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1957.
- _____ and
Jinadas, Liyanage. - Simhalayehi Pada Beduma.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1959.
- _____ - Deṭu Rukula. Colombo:
Subhadra Press, 1962.
- Chandrasekara, A. Do. - Rasa Vinisa. Colombo:
Ratnavali Press, 1967.
- De Silva, Di. Vi.
Richard. - Hela Pot Vimasuva.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1958.
- _____ - Emgalanta Rajaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1959.
- _____ - Siya Bas Vata. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1961.
- _____ - Mātara Avadiya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1963.
- _____ - Kumaratuṅgu Munidasna.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1969.

- Dissanayaka, Hiyubat. - Vilāpaya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1955.
- _____ - Nari Hināva. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1956.
- _____ - Balal Billa. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1957.
- _____ - Gunamaku Lōkaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1958.
- _____ - Jīvana Saṅgrāmaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena.
1961.
- _____ - Ravīndranāth Tāgore.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1968.
- _____ - Hiroṣimāve Maḷ. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1968.
- _____ - Akāla Ālaya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1970.
- Gambhewa, Abiram and
Kumaratunga, D. (eds.) - Hadāruva. Colombo:
Hela Havula Kamituva,
1954.
- Gunawadu, Amarasiri. - Madoldūve Hāti. Colombo:
Oriental Press, 1951.
- _____ (ed.). - Elu Attanagalu Vaṁśaya.
Colombo: Anula Press,
1952.
- _____ (ed.). - Haṁsa Sandēśaya.
Colombo: Anula Press,
1953.
- _____ (ed.). - Pārakumbā Sirit Peheliya.
Colombo: K. A. Ariyadasa,
1953.

- _____ - 'Kumaratuṅgu kiviyaṁvehi
des'. Kumāratunga Munidāsa.
Edited by Sitinamaluve
Sumanaratana. Colombo:
Peramuna Press, 1955,
pp. 166-201.
- _____ - Maha Hela Vata. Colombo:
K. A. Ariyadasa, 1957.
- _____ - Pujāvaliya. (chapters 13-
19). Colombo: Oriental
Press, 1961.
- _____ Sabihela
Alavuisi and Ahubudu,
Arisen. - Kumaratuṅgu Pādi Ekātuva.
Colombo: Department of
Cultural Affairs, 1970.
- Gunawardhana, Gamhewa. - 'Sammata Sīmhala Vādaya'.
Laṁkādhīpa. 16.2.1969.
- _____ (ed.). - Hela Heliya. Colombo:
Anula Press, 1961.
- Kumaratunga, Munidasa. - Nikāya Saṅgraha Vivaraṇaya.
(ed.) Colombo: Ratnakara Press,
1922.
- _____ (ed.). - Amāvatura (chapters 5-10).
Colombo: Vidyasagara
Press, 1922.
- _____ (ed.). - Muvadevdāvat Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: Vidyasagara
Press, 1922.
- _____ (ed.). - Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya
(chapters 5-8). Colombo:
Vidyasagara Press, 1923.
- _____ (ed.). - Subhāṣita Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: Vidyasagara Press,
1924.
- _____ (ed.). - Elu Attanagalu Vamsa
Vivaraṇaya. Colombo:
Vidyasagara Press, 1924.

- Kumaratunga, Munidasa. - Amāvaturu Vivaraṇaya
(ed.). (chapters 11-18).
Colombo: Vidyasagara Press,
1925.
- _____ (ed.). - Sāla Lihini Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: J. D. Fernando,
1925.
- _____ - Saṃskṛta Śikṣā Mārgaya.
Book I. Colombo: J. D.
Fernando, 1926.
- _____ - Haṭṭṭana (Rasayanaya I).
Colombo: Vidyasagara Press,
1927.
- _____ (ed.). - Bhūridatta Vessantara
Vivaraṇaya. Colombo:
Vidyasagara Press, 1928.
- _____ - Śikṣāvatāraya. Colombo:
Vidyasagara Press, 1929.
- _____ (ed.). - Kusajātaka Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: J. D. Fernando,
1929.
- _____ (ed.). - Saddharmālaṃkāraya
(Part IV). Colombo:
J. D. Fernando, 1929.
- _____ (ed.). - Budugunālaṃkāra Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: Vidyasagara Press,
1930.
- _____ (ed.). - Saddharmaratnāvali (Saman
devi adiya). Colombo:
Granthaprakasa Press,
1930.
- _____ - Śikṣā Mārgaya. Book I.
Colombo: J. D. Fernando,
1931.

- Kumaratunga, Munidasa (ed.). - Parevi Sandēśa Vivaranaya. Colombo: Grantha Prakasa Press, 1931.
- _____ (ed.). - Vidhura Jātaka Vivaranaya. Colombo: Vidyasagara Press, 1932.
- _____ (ed.). - Daham Sarana Vivaranaya. Colombo: J. D. Fernando, 1932.
- _____ (ed.). - Gaṅgārohana Varnanā Vivaranaya. Colombo: Y. Don Edwin, 1933.
- _____ (ed.). - Girā Sandēśa Vivaranaya. Colombo: Apa Press, 1933.
- _____ - Maṅgul Kāma (Rasāyanaya II). Colombo: J. D. Fernando, 1934.
- _____ (ed.). - Sidat Saṅgarā Vivaranaya. Colombo: Apa Press, 1934.
- _____ (ed.). - Lak Mini Pahana (73, 74). Colombo: Pahan Press, 1934.
- _____ - Kiyavana Nuvana. Colombo, Pahan Press, 1935.
- _____ - Purāna Sīmhala Akuru Karanaya. Colombo: Vidhura Press, 1935.
- _____ - Piya Samara. Colombo: Pahan Press, 1935.
- _____ - Kriyā Vivaranaya. Colombo: Apa Press, 1935.
- _____ (ed.). - Subhāṣitaya with English translation. Colombo: Pahan Press, 1936.

- Kumaratunga, Munidasa (ed.). - Mayūra Sandēśa Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1937.
- _____ (ed.). - Pujāvalī (udrta pathaya).
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1937.
- _____ (ed.). - Lōkōpakāra Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1937.
- _____ - Daśa Kumāra Caritaya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1937.
- _____ (ed.). - Tisara Sandēśa Dīpaniya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1937.
- _____ - Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1937.
- _____ (ed.). - Kustantinū Haṭana.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1938.
- _____ (ed.). - Apannaka, Vannupatha
Sērivāṇija Jātakatraya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1938.
- _____ - Prabandhōpadeśaya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1938.
- _____ - Prabandha Saṁgrahaya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1938.
- _____ - Virit Vākiya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1938.
- _____ (ed.). - Kāvyasēkhara Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: Pahan Press, 1938.

- Kumaratunga, Munidasa. - Kavi Śikṣāva. Colombo:
Pahan Press, 1939.
- _____ - Kiyavana Nuvana (Book 6).
Colombo: K. A. Ariyadasa,
1939.
- _____ (ed.). - Sasādā Vivaraṇaya.
Colombo: Ratnakara
Publishers, 1939.
- _____ (ed.). - Dhātuvamśa. Colombo:
Pahan Press, 1939.
- _____ (ed.). - Subasa. Vol. I, nos.
1-16. Colombo: Pahan
Press, 1939.
- _____ - Kiyavana Nuvana (Book 7).
Colombo: K. A. Ariyadasa,
1940.
- _____ (ed.). - Subasa. Vol. I, nos.
17-26; Vol. II, nos.
1-18. Colombo: Pahan
Press, 1940.
- _____ (ed.). - The Helio. Vol. I, nos.
1-16. Colombo: K. A.
Ariyadasa, 1941.
- _____ (ed.). - Subasa. Vol. II, nos.
19-32; Vol. III, nos.
1-24. Colombo: Pahan
Press, 1941.
- _____ - Hinsāraya (Rasāyanaya, III).
Colombo: K. A. Ariyadasa,
1942.
- _____ (ed.). - Subasa. Vol. III, nos.
25-36. Colombo: Pahan
Press, 1942.

- Kumaratunga, Munidasa. - Hela Miyāsiya. Colombo:
K. A. Ariyadasa, 1942.
- _____ - Ibē Sakuva. Colombo:
K. A. Ariyadasa, 1942.
- _____ (ed.). - Kav Silu Mina. Colombo:
K. A. Ariyadasa, 1942.
- Nanaloka, Kodagoda
(ed.). - Amāvaturu nam 'purisa-
dammasārathi' padavarna-
nāva. Colombo: M. D.
Gunasena. 1959.
- Sabihela, Alavuisi. - Govin̄du Giya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1960.
- _____ (ed.). - Simhala Bodhi Vamsāya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1962.
- _____ (ed.). - Saṇḍa Kiṇḍuru Dā Samara.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1962.
- _____ (ed.). - Kovul Saṇḍes Vivaranaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1962.
- _____ (ed.). - Siyabas Lakara Vivaruva.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1963.
- _____ (ed.). - Parevi Saṇḍes Pahadanaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1967.
- _____ - Devlova Manamāliya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1968.
- Silruvan, Warakagoda. - Lamā Viruva. Panadura:
Pahan Press, 1941.

Tennakon, Rayipiyal
(ed.).

- Parevi Sandēśaya.
Colombo: J. D. Fernando,
1932.
- Anurapura Bāsima hā
Vātima. Colombo: D. S.
Mandalavala, 1932.
- Yata Giya Davasa.
Colombo: Nuvana Press,
1938.
- Vavuluva. Colombo:
Pahan Press, 1939.
- Hāvilla. Colombo:
Anula Press, 1940.
- Dā Vinaya. Panadura:
Pahan Press, 1941.
- Elu Attanagalu Vamsāya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1953.
- Kavuduva. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1954.
- Mulutāna Andaraya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1954.
- Sidat Saṅgarāva.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1954.
- Giya Kala 1. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1955.
- 'Munidas Maṅga'. Kumāra-
tunga Munidāsa. Edited by
Sitinamaluve Sumanaratana.
Colombo: Peramuna Press,
1955, pp. 72-99.

(ed.).

(ed.).

Tennakon, Rayipiyal

- Anurapura Pirihīma.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1955.
- _____ - Apē Yatagiyāva. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1955.
- _____ - Bas Pāra. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1955.
- _____ - Totu Andaraya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1956.
- _____ (ed.). - Sālalihini Sandēśaya.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1956.
- _____ - Siṃhala Vamsāya.
Maharagama: Saman Press, 1956.
- _____ - Paramgi Samaya. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1958.
- _____ (ed.). - Vidāgama Maitraya Himi-
yangē Prabandha. Colombo:
M. D. Gunasena, 1960.
- _____ (ed.). - Buduguna Alamkāra Pradīpaya.
Colombo: Sri Lanka Pub-
lishers, 1961.
- _____ (ed.). - Kōkila Sandēśaya.
Colombo: Sri Lanka Pub-
lishers, 1962.
- _____ - Hoṇḍa Siṃhala. Colombo:
Sri Lanka Publishers, 1962.
- _____ (ed.). - Girā Sandēśaya. Colombo:
Sri Lanka Publishers, 1962.

- Tennakon, Rayipiyal (ed.). - Siri Rahal Pabaṇḍa. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1962.
- _____ - Gāmi Baṇa. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1964.
- Vitharana, Vinnie. - 'Sumaṅgala guru parapurē sāhityasēvava'. Sri Sumaṅgala. Edited by Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratna Abeysekara. Colombo: Anula Press, 1962.
- _____ - 'In search of a standard in Sinhalese'. Ceylon Daily News. 19.11.1967, p. 4.
- _____ - 'A Critical Survey of the Contribution made by Munidasa Kumaratunga to Sinhalese language and Literature'. Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1968.
- Wirasekara, Jayanta (ed.) - Kukavi Vādaya. Colombo: Anula Press, 1938.

(ii) Other works

- Abeysinghe, Tikiri. - Portuguese Rule in Ceylon 1594-1612. Colombo: Lake House Investments Ltd., 1966.
- Abhayasinghe, P. M. P. - Udarāṭa Vittī. Maharagama: Saman Press, 1960.

- Amarasekara, Gunadasa. - Aliyā saha Andhayō.
Colombo: Anula Press,
1966.
- Bell, H. C. P. - 'Letter from the Kandyan
Court'. Ceylon Antiquary
and Literary Register,
vol. I, pt. II, pp. 118-
123.
- Bloomfield, L. - Language. New York: Holt,
Rinehart and Winston,
1933.
- Bright, William
(ed.). - Sociolinguistics. The
Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Butsarana - Edited by Walivitiye
Sorata. Colombo: K. D. P.
Amarasekara, 1931.
- Codrington, H. W. - A Short History of Ceylon.
London: Macmillan & Co.
Ltd., 1926; revised edi-
tion, 1947.
- Crystal, David. - Linguistics. Pelican,
1971.
- Dahamsonḍadā Kava - Edited by Walivitiye
Sorata. Colombo, 1934.
- Dhampiyā Atuvā Gāta
Padaya - Edited by M. Vimalakitti.
Colombo: M. D. Gunasena,
1960.
- De Silva, Colvin R. - Ceylon Under the British
Occupation 1795-1833.
Colombo: Apothecaries,
1941.
- De Silva, M. W. Sugatha-
pala and Coates, W. A. - 'The Segmental Phonemes
of Sinhalese'. University
of Ceylon Review, vol.
XVIII, nos. 1 and 2 (1960),
pp. 163-175.

De Silva, M. W.
Sugathapala

- 'Effects of Purism on the Evolution of the Written Language: Case History of the Situation in Sinhalese'. Linguistics 36 (1967). The Hague: Mouton, pp. 5-17. ✓
- 'Some linguistic peculiarities of Sinhalese poetry'. Linguistics 60 (1970), pp. 5-26.
- 'Convergence in diglossia : The Sinhalese situation'. International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics, vol. 3, no. 1 (January 1974). Trivandrum: Department of Linguistics, University of Kerala, pp. 60-91.
- 'Some consequences of Diglossia'. York Papers in Linguistics 4 (1974). York: Department of Language, University of York, pp. 71-90.
- 'Problems of literacy in diglossic communities'. Literacy Discussion: Unesco Special Number in Mother-tongue Literacy (forthcoming).

Devaraja, L. S.

- The Kandyan Kingdom of Ceylon. Colombo: Lake House Investments Ltd., 1972.

Dharmadasa, K. N. O.

- 'Spoken and Written Sinhalese: A Contrastive Study'. M. Phil. thesis, University of York, 1967.

- Dharmarama, Ratmalane Sri (ed.). - Haṃsa Sandēśaya. Colombo: Maha Bodhi Press, 1902.
- _____ (ed.). - Pāli Bodhivaṃsa Gātapadaya. Colombo: Satyasamuccaya Press, 1910.
- _____ (ed.). - Kāvyaśēkhara Mahā Kāvyaaya. Colombo: Lankabhinava Press, 1915.
- _____ (ed.). - Dharmapradīpikā. Kalaniya: Vidyalankara Press, 1951.
- Dimock, Edward C. - 'Literary and Colloquial Bengali'. Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), pp. 43-63.
- Dinneen, Francis P. - An Introduction to General Linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Epigraphia Zeylanica - Vols. I-II. Edited by D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe. Colombo: Archaeological Department of Ceylon, 1904-1927.
- Ferguson, Charles A. - 'Diglossia'. Word, vol. 15 (1959), pp. 325-340; reprinted in Language and Social Context. Edited by Pier Paolo Giglioli. Penguins, 1972, pp. 232-251. ✓
- _____ - 'Problems of teaching languages with diglossia'. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics. Edited by E. D. Woodworth and R. J. Di Pietro. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1962, pp. 163-177.

- Ferguson, Charles A. - 'Myths about Arabic'.
Readings in the Sociology of Language. Edited by J. A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1968, pp. 375-381.
-
- Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), Introduction.
- Fishman, J. A. (ed.). - Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.
- Gair, J. W. - 'Sinhalese Diglossia'.
Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 10, no. 8 (1968), pp. 1-15.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. - A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language. Colombo: The Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch, 1938.
- Gunawardhana, W. F. (ed.). - Guttīla Kāvya Varnanā. Colombo: N. J. Cooray, 1916 (second edition).
- Guruge, Ananda. - Return to righteousness: A collection of speeches, essays and letters of Anagarika Dharmapala. Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1965.
-
- Srī Sumaṅgala. Edited by Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara. Colombo: Anula Press, 1962, Introduction.

- Hall, Robert A. - Introductory Linguistics. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1964.
- Haṃsa Sandēśaya - Edited by C. E. Godakumbura. Colombo: Apothecaries, 1953.
- Hettiaratchi, D. E. - 'Sinhalese'. University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. I, pt. I. Edited by H. C. Ray and S. Paranavitana. Colombo: Ceylon University Press, 1959, pp. 33-36.
- Hockett, C. F. - A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan, 1958.
- Householder, F. W. - 'Greek Diglossia'. Mono-graph Series on Languages and Linguistics, no. 15 (1962). Edited by E. D. Woodworth and R. J. Di Pietro. Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp. 109-132.
- Iriyagolla, I. M. R. A. - Dēva Tāpaya. Colombo: Svastika Press, 1943.
- _____ - Dēva Varaya. Colombo: Svastika Press, 1947.
- _____ - Manutāpaya. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1953.
- _____ - Purna Viplavaya. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1959.
- Kavsilumina - Edited by Madugalle Siddhattha. Colombo: Government Press, 1926.

- Kavsilumina - Edited by Walivitiye Sorata. Colombo: Anula Press, 1949.
- Kearney, Robert N. - Communalism and Language in the Politics of Ceylon. Duke University Press, 1967.
- Kroeber, A. L. - Anthropology. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1948 (revised edition).
- Kulasuriya, Ananda. - Siṃhala Sāhityaya 1. Maharagama: Saman Press, 1962.
- Kusajātaka Kāvya - Edited by A. M. Gunasekara. Colombo: Wijayarathne Press, 1897.
- Lak Raja Lō Sirita - Palm-leaf Manuscript. British Museum, OR 6603 (65) 665.
- Lanarolle, V. D. De. - 'Kumāratunga Munidāsa caritayen biṇḍak'. Kumaratunga Munidasa. Edited by Sitinamaluve Sumanaratana. Colombo: Peramuna Press, 1955, pp. 211-218.
- Langacker, R. W. - Language and Its Structure. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, inc. 1968.
- Lyons, John. - Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- _____ (ed.). - New Horizons in Linguistics. Penguin, 1970.

- Mahanama, Chandradasa. - 'After Kumaratunga - the vacuum'. Daily News. 12.7.1966, pp. 4-5.
- Malmberg, Bertil. - Structural Linguistics and Human Communication. Heidelberg: Springer, 1963.
- _____ - New Trends in Linguistics. Stockholm, 1964.
- Mendis, G. C. - Ceylon Today and Yesterday. Colombo: Associated News Papers of Ceylon, 1957.
- Moulton, William G. - 'What Standard for Diglossia? The case of German Switzerland'. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, no. 15 (1962). Edited by E. D. Woodworth and R. J. Di Pietro. Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp. 133-148.
- Paranavitana, S. - Inscriptions of Ceylon Vol. I. Colombo: Archaeology Department of Ceylon, 1970.
- Perera, H. S. - Sinhala Kiyavīm Pota. Colombo: Education Department, 1934.
- Pillai, M. Shanmugam. - 'Tamil - Literary and Colloquial'. Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 26, no. 3, pt. III (July 1960), pp. 27-42.
- _____ - 'Merger of literary and colloquial Tamil'. Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 4 (1965), pp. 98-103.

- Pūjāvaliya - Edited by Bentota Saddhattissa. Panadura: P. J. Karunadhara Press, 1930.
- Rajakaruna, Ariya. - Sampradāya hā Sihina Lōkaya. Colombo: Ratna Publishers, 1968.
- Rajapaksa, Piya Ratna. - Sēvāva. Colombo: Anula Press, 1970.
- Rajaratnākaraya - Edited by Simon de Silva. Colombo: The Government Press, 1907.
- Rajāvaliya - Edited by Pemananda Bhikkhu. Colombo: Granthaparakasa Press, 1926.
- Rammandala, M. Sri. - 'Saranānkara Saṅgharājayan vahansē'. Mahanuvara Sri Puṣpadāna Swarna Jayanti Saṅgrahaya. Edited by M. B. Ariyapala and C. Godage, 1958, pp. 31-37.
- Ratanasara, H. - British Policies, Buddhism and Pirivena Education. Kalaniya: Vidyālankara Press, 1970.
- Reynolds, C. H. B. - 'Participial forms in early Sinhalese prose'. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. XXVII, no. I (1964), pp. 129-150.
- Robins, R. H. - A Short History of Linguistics. London: Longmans, 1967.
- Saddharमारatnāvaliya - Edited by D. B. Jayatilaka. Colombo: Lankabhinava Visruta Press, 1936.

- Sammata Siṃhala Vārtāva. - Colombo: Educational Publications Department, 1968.
- Sammata Siṃhalaya - Lamkāvē Viśva Vidyālayanhi Siṃhala pilibāṇḍa ācārya-varuṅgē vārtāva (unpublished).
- Sanṅharāja Sādhucariyāva. - Edited by Nahalle Pannasena and P. B. Sannasgala. Colombo: Lake House, 1947.
- Sanṅa Raja Vata - Edited by Dikwalle Pemananda. Galle: Kalyani Publishers, 1952.
- Sannasgala, P. B. - Siṃhala Sāhitya Vamsāya. Colombo: Lake House, 1961.
- _____ - 'Lakdiva piriven itihāsaya hā Vidyodayē sēvāva'. Sri Sumangala. Edited by Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara. Colombo: Anula Press, 1962, pp. 54-63.
- Sarachchandra, E. R. - The Sinhalese Novel. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1950.
- _____ - 'Sinhalese Language and Literature'. University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol. III. Edited by K. M. D. Silva. Colombo: The Colombo Apothecaries Co. Ltd., 1973, pp. 343-355.
- Sārārtha Saṅgrahaya - Edited by H. Silaratana. Colombo: Vidyarthaprakasa Press, 1927.
- Sasanaratana, M. - 'Mahanuvara Yugayē bhāṣāva'. Sāhityaya 1 (1961), pp. 5-8.

- Sāsanāvatirna Varnanā - Edited by C. E. Godakumbura. Moratuwa: D. P. Dodangoda & Co., 1956.
- Shanmugam, S. V. - 'Modernization in Tamil'. Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 17, no. 2 (February 1975), pp. 53-67.
- Silva, M. H. Peter. - 'Influence of Dravida on Sinhalese'. D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1961.
- Silva, W. A. - Vijayabā Kollaya. Colombo: Peramuna Press, 1950 (fourth edition).
- Simhala 1-13 - Educational Publications Department, Colombo, 1965-1969.
- Somaratne, G. V. P. - 'Political History of the kingdom of Kotte'. Ph. D. thesis, University of London, 1970.
- Stewart, William A. - 'Functional distribution of Creole French in Haiti'. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics. Edited by E. D. Woodworth and R. J. Di Pietro. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1962, pp. 149-162.
- Sumanajoti, Degammada. - 'Mahanuvara Yugayē gadya kṛti'. Vidyalankara Simhala Sangarava, 1960-1961, pp. 10-34.
- Sumanaratana, Sitinamaluve (ed.). - Kumāratunga Munidāsa. Colombo: Peramuna Press, 1955.

- Surawira, A. V. - 'Purātana sāhityāvaliyē avasānaya hā nūtana yugayē ārambaya'. Srī Sumaṅgala. Edited by Kadihingala Sorata and Premaratne Abeysekara, pp. 64-82.
- Tilakaratna, Amunugoda - Gatkaru Hamuva. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1964.
- Trudgill, Peter. - Sociolinguistics. Penguins, 1974.
- University of Ceylon
History of Ceylon - Vol. III. Edited by K. M. D. Silva. Colombo: The Colombo Apothecaries Ltd., 1973.
- Voegelin, C. F. and F. M. - 'Greek'. Anthropological Linguistics, vol. 7, no. 8 (1965), pp. 158-176.
- Wachissara, Kotagama. - Saranāṅkara Saṅgharāja Samaya. Colombo: Y. Don Adwin & Co., 1960.
- _____ - 'Wālivita Saranāṅkara and the revival of Buddhism in Ceylon'. Ph. D. thesis, University of London, 1961.
- Wickramasingha, Martin - Rōhini. Galkissa: Mount Press, 1929.
- _____ - Vicāra Lipi. Galkissa: Mount Press, 1941.
- _____ - Nava Padya Siṁhalaya. Maharagama: Saman Press, 1957.
- _____ - Siṁhala Sāhityayē Nāṅgīma. Galkissa: Mount Press, 1954 (fifth print).

- Wickramasingha, Martin - Banākathā Sāhityaya.
Maharagama: Saman Press,
1958.
- _____ - 'Hikkaḍuvē nāyaka māhimiyō
hā vartamana sāhityayē
ārambaya'. Sumaṅgala.
Edited by Kadihingala Sorata
and Premaratne Abeysekara.
Colombo: Anula Press,
1962, pp. 27-42.
- Wijayaratne, D. J. - History of the Sinhalese
Noun. Colombo: University
Press, 1956.
- Wijesekara, O. H. de A. - 'Pali and Sanskrit in the
Polonnaruwa Period'. The
Ceylon Historical Journal,
vol. IV (1955), pp. 91-97.

Newspapers

Daily News (Colombo), 12.7.1966; 19.11.67.

Dinamina (Colombo), 3.3.1944; 29.1.1969; 5.2.1969;
10.2.1969; 16.2.1969; 10.4.1969;
9.7.1970.

Lankādīpa (Colombo) 16.2.1969.

Silumina (Colombo) 1.4.1969.